

The Nation.

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, APRIL 25, 1878.

The Week.

THE *Herald* has "interviewed" all the members of both Houses *seriatim* with the view of ascertaining their opinions with regard to the Blair scheme of reopening the Presidential question, and found that all but an insignificant minority treat it with utter contempt. Only fifteen were found willing to favor it. This is what might have been expected, and, in fact, it has been so near being well known that the amount of space given to the subject in the newspapers has been singular. Apropos of this, the chairman of the Florida Returning Board and some other members have, it is said, confessed to frauds in the count of the vote in various counties. Whether the confession be true or false, it is of little consequence now except as showing the character of the men whose performances the country watched with breathless interest in the winter of 1876-7 and nearly went to war over, and as showing, too, the enormous importance of arranging some plain mode of deciding disputes at the count in Washington before another election. We are in the second year of Mr. Hayes's term and Congress is near adjournment, and nothing has yet been done, although it is certain the country will be in a most inflammable condition on this subject in 1880.

The interview with Mr. Conkling published in the *World* proves to be the production of a Mr. Mines, a former editor of a Conkling paper in Utica, who recently met the Senator at dinner in that city. Mr. Conkling was, of course, promptly waited on by the reporters to see what he had to say about it; but his denial or repudiation only went to the complete accuracy or fulness of the report. In fact, the conversation seems to have been in the main correctly rendered. According to some, the interviewer is a base person who has betrayed the confidence of a private dinner-party; according to others, the whole affair was, like the interview published some time ago in the *Herald*, arranged beforehand, including the partial disavowal of the interviewer, and is simply a mode by which Mr. Conkling likes to get certain opinions and stories before the public without assuming too much responsibility for them. The sentiments ascribed to him are generally recognized by his friends as his, and are highly approved of. He has, it appears, decided not to bring the matter up in the Senate. It will be observed that in neither interview does he display the smallest interest in any subject of legislation. His talk runs, as his thoughts doubtless run, on "the mechanism of government"—or, in other words, on offices, the persons who got them, and those who ought to have got them and didn't, the knavery by which some were cheated out of them, and the folly with which they were bestowed on others. Of real politics there is no mention, and, in fact, it seems as if it did not matter much to him what bills passed or did not pass, provided they did not interfere with his personal fortunes.

The interview is a curious picture of political manners, and of the type of statesmen who are succeeding the old pro-slavery and anti-slavery men. These at least believed and felt strongly about subjects. Even the vain men among them, Mr. Sumner for instance, went out of themselves and were easily roused into passionate advocacy of measures which in no way concerned them personally. The new men appear incapable of anything of the kind. They are ready to vote for a measure, or vote against it, or keep silent about it, or "straddle" it, with sole reference to their own fortunes. The vanity, too, of the old school, as in Mr. Sumner's case, was based on the possession, real or supposed, of certain intellectual powers or accomplishments, on knowledge or eloquence, or great achievements; the vanity of the Conkling type, on the other hand,

is simply what Daudet in the *Nabab* happily calls "vanité dindonnière," or turkey-cock vanity—that is, the self-esteem of a male animal *quâ* male animal, without reference to the quality of his powers or the use made of them.

Mr. Blaine "straddled" the tariff question most successfully in a speech at Chester, Pa., on Saturday. After giving a woful and perfectly correct account of the decline of American shipping since 1860, and the transfer of our carrying trade to European bottoms, he said the Government as well as the people had made enormous donations in aid of the construction of railroads for the transportation of our products from the interior to the shores of the ocean; therefore it should not stop at the shores of the ocean, but should help to pay the expense of transporting them to Europe. The fun of this is—for it is funny—that one would suppose from Mr. Blaine's discourse that the goods lay on the beach worthless for want of any means of reaching the European market. The fact is, that our enormous exports, on reaching the beach, find more ships than they can possibly fill waiting to carry them abroad at unprecedentedly cheap rates, so that the owners of the products could not possibly be better served than they are. What Mr. Blaine proposes is, that these owners should now make up a purse, in the shape of taxation, to pay shipowners for carrying their goods at present rates; that is, that besides their ordinary freight they should pay a bonus through the Government. After this, one would have supposed that he would announce his intention of advocating in Congress a Government subsidy to American shipping. Nothing of the kind. Throwing one leg over the subject, he said that he spoke only as "an American citizen," that there was much opposition to subsidies in the public mind, and that what he would advocate in Congress it would be "improper" to mention.

On Wednesday week the Senate indefinitely postponed a bill introduced by General Burnside, of which the design was to enlist colored soldiers on the same footing as whites—i.e., to distribute them through the ranks and not gather them in regiments by themselves. On the same day Mr. Voorhees's famous resolution declaring it "of the highest importance that the financial credit of the Government be maintained," etc., was called up by that gentleman and passed without opposition. On Tuesday, the 23d, the bill to extend the time for the completion of the Northern Pacific Railroad was passed. The Senate has done little else except voting to adjourn on June 10. This resolution was immediately brought up in the House and opposed by Mr. Wood, who, in the interest of his tariff measure, demanded its reference to the Committee of Ways and Means, of which he is Chairman. He was defeated, having against him all those, of both parties, who do not wish the existing tariff disturbed—at least in the way he proposes to disturb it; but on Thursday he recovered control of his party, and on Friday he secured not a reference but a postponement of the resolution till May 15, by a vote of 129 to 113, a few Democrats voting with the minority. On Monday, Butler's bill to provide a convenient currency by the reissue of fractional notes, and of one and two-dollar notes to the amount of one-sixth of the whole legal-tender notes outstanding, came up under his call for a suspension of the rules to put it on its passage, and received only 120 votes against 124. The River and Harbor Appropriations Bill, involving an outlay of upwards of seven millions, was more fortunate, and in spite of much uproar and a vigorous protest on the part of Mr. S. S. Cox and other Democrats, was passed without debate and without consideration in Committee of the Whole, the rules having been suspended for the purpose. The strength of the measure had been carefully calculated in advance by "natural selection," the West and the South being allotted about six millions against less than a million and a half for

the Eastern and Middle States, where, nevertheless, the evidences of *quid pro quo* were also plainly visible.

The vote on this bill was followed for two days by very unusual scenes of disorder, owing to a formal protest entered by Mr. S. S. Cox and signed by himself and twenty-seven others, setting forth the reasons why bills of this character ought to be debated and carefully examined in detail. Some of these were sound, as that there is in them a tendency to combine local interests "for general spoliation upon the Treasury"; while others, as that the House has a sacred right and a traditional privilege to consider appropriations, and that the constitutional authority to "regulate commerce among the several States" does not justify the improvement of rivers whose course lies wholly within a single State, seem open to objection. The majority (whether two-thirds or less) is the House for all practical purposes, and it cannot be said by any action of its own to deprive the House of a right, whatever may be thought of the rights of the minority. On the other hand, a river like the Hudson is, although wholly in New York State, as much a part of the navigable waters of the United States as is the harbor at its mouth. So far as the protest was directed against indecent haste in the appropriation of public moneys, especially for objects that will not bear scrutiny, it ought to command public sympathy, although it seems out of place except in the body of a speech, and was, we think, rightly pronounced by the House not a question of privilege. But Mr. Cox might have remembered his own share in suppressing debate on a measure of infinitely greater moment—the Silver Bill. The time to respect the rights of the minority is when one is in the majority.

The same question will, we apprehend, arise when the Tariff Bill fairly comes upon the scene. There appears to be little expectation that Mr. Wood can save it from its enemies, who are mainly but not wholly on the Republican side, unless by the exercise of the severest party discipline, and for this almost the only instrument at his disposal is the "previous question." There is, from the democratic point of view, a great injustice as well as absurdity in the Committee of Ways and Means forcing such an important measure on the House without any opportunity for discussing it; but it must be said that our experience is rather favorable to such a course. We have already expressed our belief that the House can do little more than mar the present bill, not because we are not conscious of its imperfections, but because from the tussle of private interests in open House there are sure to emerge greater and more serious inconsistencies. Jobbery stands a better chance with a mixed, uncritical assembly which cannot stop to detect the motive that lurks behind innocent phraseology, than with a committee of ordinary integrity and discernment. It would stand no chance whatever with a chancellor of the exchequer whose duty it was to devise tariffs or to modify them, and who would be held responsible to the whole country for changes in the interest of private parties. In this, we believe, lies the solution which would satisfy the spasmodic scruples of Mr. Cox about the right of debating all fiscal measures, and relieve the anxiety felt by all friends of rational legislation whenever Congress undertakes to deal with such complex and scientific questions as the revenue. Mr. Sherman and his budget are a dream of the future, but Mr. Wood's budget has been spread before the country, and has generally been recognized as a substantial advance over anything that has preceded it in this generation, if not in any other. We may think the sugar-refiners would not fare so well in the House as they do in the bill, but we may be pretty sure that if they are cast out there will be found plenty of decaying interests to take their places. As between the abuse of the rules of the House in the employment of the previous question, and the abuse of debate, the country may in this instance profitably choose the former.

Bills on London advanced during the week to 4.89½ to 4.89¼, or, in other words, to the rate which makes the export of gold coin

profitable. Accordingly the price of gold advanced to 100½ from 100¼ to 100½ last week. The rise in sterling was not caused by importations of United States bonds, but by the reduced supply of commercial bills at a time when the receipts of foreign silver were large. The Treasury, with the approval of the Syndicate bankers, has re-established its London agency, and a large amount of 4½ per cent. bonds were sent there during the week. Even with the rise in gold and the hostility shown in Congress to any kind of specie payments, the sales of 4½ per cent. bonds in this country continue, and more than one-half of the first \$10,000,000 have been sold. Among bankers there is no doubt that resumption, according to the Treasury plan, will be begun at the appointed time. General business is somewhat better than it was, but the spring trade for 1878 will be remembered as the worst in the history of the country. The reports concerning the growing crops are, however, most encouraging, and there comes from Chicago the astonishing information that harvesting of winter wheat in Illinois will be begun in May. Silver in London ruled at 53½d. to 54d. per oz. At the close of the week the bullion value of the silver dollar was \$0.9137 gold. The gold value of the legal-tender note was \$0.9950.

Belgium, as a great manufacturer and exporter, and a member of the Latin Union and one of the double-standard nations, has discussed the silver question as much as any other country. Its leading financiers have now for some years been slowly giving up the double standard as a chimera. What Belgium has to say in reply to our invitation to European nations to join us in the great silver experiment is, therefore, of considerable importance. It is to be found in an article from the leading commercial paper, the *Précurseur* of Antwerp, translated in the last *Economist*. It is worth the attentive perusal of the sons of thunder in Cincinnati and Chicago, but we can only give a brief summary of it. It says the international understanding can only be negotiated on the ratio of 15½ to 1; but there could be no guarantee that this, if agreed on, could be kept up without regard to the market value of bullion; that its universal adoption, anyhow, is a utopian idea; that what will probably result from the attempt will be the division of the commercial world into two camps—the gold camp and the double-standard camp; that the latter, no matter what it may say, will be really a silver camp; that from this division great commercial disturbance and great difficulty in adjusting exchanges will result; that if legislators indulge in Utopias commercial men will have to protect themselves as the Californians did against the greenbacks. The poor "gold-bug" concludes as follows, evidently not having heard the convincing yells from the Mississippi valley:

"It is obvious that the solution of the problem proposed by the bi-metallists is not so easy as they imagine. From whatever side it is considered there is nothing but uncertainty and obscurity. What the bi-metallists propose is nothing else than a leap in the dark; and we doubt whether there are to be found statesmen worthy of the name who will consent to take the responsibility upon themselves of a realization of so chimerical a project. On the contrary, every doubt and uncertainty would fade away if it were decided to deal summarily with the question by adopting the single standard of gold."

The fresh news about the Anglo-Russian imbroglio is that Bismarck is still trying to mediate, and that opinions about the probability of his success vary from day to day. One of the signs that he is not acting wholly in the Russian interest is the cordial reception given by him to the Rumanian agents presenting the strong protest of the Principality against the annexation of Bessarabia and the stipulation with Turkey, without the sanction or adhesion of Rumania, for the passage of Russian troops through the territory of the latter for two years. The fact is that the defence of the Bessarabian clause in the Treaty of San Stefano was the one weak point in Prince Gortchakoff's reply to the Marquis of Salisbury. Annexation cannot be justified. The territory taken does not belong to Turkey; it belongs to Rumania, which has done nothing to warrant Russia in exacting any sacrifice from her. On the contrary, her aid during the war was invaluable, and gave her a

fair claim to a share in the negotiations, as well as to compensation. Nor is the annexation necessary in any way to the protection of the Christians or the organization of the new Bulgaria. It is, in fact, simply proposed as a sentimental tribute by the Czar to his father's memory; but it is asking too much of the Western powers to ask them to allow an important feature in the Treaty of 1856 to be set aside on this ground.

In England the effect of the Gortchakoff Note appears to have been pacificatory, and its power as an answer is not denied. In France it has had the effect of checking the strong support given hitherto by the press to the English position. The *Temps* acknowledges the absurdity of the claim of Lord Beaconsfield and the *Pall Mall Gazette*, on which we commented last week, that Russia shall bring her treaty to the Congress as a mere "suggestion," or petition, after having sacrificed 100,000 lives in getting the Turk to sign it. It admits that, although it might be desirable that Russia should do this, it is preposterous to expect her to do it. It might go further, and say that as long as England proposes nothing of her own in place of or in amendment of the Treaty, it is almost insulting to ask Russia to submit it for simple approval or disapproval. Gortchakoff, in fact, is at his strongest when he says: If you do not like this, say what you do like, and then we shall both appear on equal terms at the Congress, each with his plan; but do not ask us to appear like a suppliant for the simple acceptance or rejection of our plan only.

There has, however, been since the beginning no more important contribution to the controversy than the great debate in the House of Lords on the 8th instant, when Lord Beaconsfield moved the address in reply to the Queen's message. He went over the situation in a speech lasting more than an hour, following substantially the line of Lord Salisbury's despatch. He commented on the secrecy with which the negotiations with the Turks were conducted in spite of the warning given by England that the Powers would have to be parties to any treaty that might be concluded. When the Congress was proposed by Austria, England asked that there might be an agreement beforehand that all the questions raised by the Treaty of San Stefano should be submitted as "subject to be discussed," to which Prince Gortchakoff replied with "classic ambiguity" that the Treaty would be submitted and each Power "would then have full liberty of criticism and action." Lord Beaconsfield then went over the Treaty article by article, showing that it destroyed Turkey in Europe, created a new Principality wholly under Russian influence, promised reforms in Epirus and Thessaly to be framed by Russian hands, would convert the Black Sea into a Russian lake, put the commercial communications between Turkey and Persia in her power, and would enable her to march down through Syria against the Suez Canal. He wound up by threatening Russia with an army of 74,000 men, which, like a true rhetorician, he did not show to be equal to the job proposed, but said it was double the British force ever commanded by Marlborough or Wellington. In fact, most of the speech reminded one forcibly of the political speculations of 'Coningsby.'

He was followed by Lord Derby in the most powerful speech the latter ever made, and which nothing but national madness can prevent having a great effect out of doors. Some of his opening revelations upon the causes of his resignation showed the kind of comedy in which the Cabinet had been engaged—such, for instance, as that he had determined to resign on account of the proposal to ask the vote of £6,000,000, but had been pacified by the Chancellor of the Exchequer's statement that they needed a vote of confidence, and that only a small part of the money would be spent; so that the demand for the money, in so far as the blame of it was put on Russia, was in great part buncombe. Lord Derby then pointed out that the gravity attributed to the failure of the Congress was largely factitious, inasmuch as the questions it was expected to settle could be settled by negotiation between individual Powers; he showed, with the clearness of a man who knows what he is talking about, that in

case of war England could count on no ally but Austria, and that Austria, owing to the peculiar composition of her population and her army, could not be relied on for a long war, and might at any stage in the struggle be compelled to make separate terms with Russia. He then came to the tremendous question—What is to be the object of the war? It cannot be to restore Turkey, for all are agreed that that is impossible. If it is to procure a reduction in the amount of the indemnity, there is no good reason for thinking that this cannot be accomplished by peaceful negotiation. There is, he said, however, behind these excuses a stronger motive than any of them, and that is a desire to restore English prestige, which the public has got into its head has been diminished. He denied that English prestige had been diminished: the existing anxiety about her course all over Europe was proof of the contrary. But if it had been diminished, it was due to the ridiculous course of the English public in refusing passionately eighteen months ago to interfere in behalf of Turkey, and in now proposing just as passionately to go to attack Russia for conquering her, as if nobody supposed that the war could result in her defeat. He closed with a stroke which had the force of a sledge-hammer, by asking what England would do, supposing she now went to war and took from Russia all Russia had won. She could not retain European Turkey, or even substitute in it English influence for Russian influence, because Russian influence had roots which neither the English nor Austrian sword could destroy, namely: community of religion, traditional and historic sympathies, and a common hatred of a common enemy.

The anxiety prevailing in England about the war, and which many people begin to fear the Government is bent on at all hazards, is aggravated by a great strike in Lancashire, throwing between 80,000 and 90,000 persons out of employment, and intended to resist a reduction of wages. There is not much likelihood that the operatives can succeed, but the struggle will of course cause vast suffering and loss, and is likely to last for many weeks. The one remedy for these collisions between labor and capital is, as Mr. Brassey has so well pointed out, the employment by the workingmen of agents or representatives capable of understanding the conditions of the employer's business and the force of his arguments about wages; but no progress in this direction has been made, and there is, of course, the great difficulty that any person competent to fill such a place could do better.

The Berlin correspondent of the London *Times* recently gave an account of the funeral of the noted Socialist Heinsch in that city, and it contained many things which are supplying food for reflection both in Germany and elsewhere. Heinsch's coffin was followed by 10,000 men and women wearing red ribbons and flowers, red being, as in Paris, the Socialist color. To avoid giving the occasion an air of solemnity the men mostly smoked as they went, and also dropped out of the ranks now and then to take a pull of beer. He was buried in the cemetery of the sect, which has inscribed over the gate: "There is no hereafter and no meeting again." The funeral discourse was long, and, besides praise of Heinsch, ridiculed the idea of his being judged by anybody but the people, and advised all true Socialists to follow his example in being good haters. The ostentatious contempt of the party for the Christian religion is ascribed to a recent ill-advised attempt of some of the clergy to start a mission among the Socialists, in which, in order to make religion more attractive, they proposed along with it laws for the regulation of labor and heavy taxation of the rich. The plan met with the fate that might have been expected. At the first meeting the ministers were interrupted with ribald and blasphemous remarks, and the hymns were drowned in obscene songs. Finally a Socialist speaker took possession of the audience and abused the clergy, and ridiculed the idea of a future life, and encouraged his brethren to fix their attention on this and get all they could out of it, and leave Christianity for the Hottentots. The movement has died out, leaving the Socialists more bitter and determined than ever.

OUR POSITION IN CASE OF A WAR.

THE fact that the newspapers on both sides of the Atlantic have already begun to discuss the position which this country will occupy in case of a European war, shows at least that the matter is worth consideration. The despatch published in the *Herald* a week or two since to the effect that in case of war Russia was going to fit out a fleet of "corsairs," with an organization apparently similar to that of a benevolent society, and with one of the Grand Dukes as its chief officer—possibly to give it a good position in the fashionable world—seemed a little improbable; but it has been followed by another to the effect that Russia is already buying American ships (as of course she has now a perfect right to do if she can find them) for use should a war break out; while Sir Samuel Baker has written a letter to the *London Times*, prophesying that in case of war Russia "will issue letters of marque to American adventurers, and a swarm of *Alabamas* may interrupt our commerce." From these and other indications it appears to be the popular impression in Russia, and in certain quarters in England, that privateering instead of being (as it was formerly considered) a belligerent privilege, has ripened into a cardinal neutral right; and that the main business of a neutral nation in time of war is to fit out fleets of armed cruisers to prey upon the commerce of the belligerents. It would appear to be a corollary from this view that the neutral must prey upon both belligerents equally; but some publicists may take the ground that a discrimination may be made, possibly applying Count Bernstorff's doctrine of "benevolent neutrality" to this new case, or holding (under the decision of the Geneva Tribunal that the "due diligence" required of a neutral must be exercised in proportion to the likelihood of damage to the respective belligerents) that, Russia having no commerce to speak of, we are bound to destroy the English mercantile marine, to make everything even at the start.

It is, we may say at the outset, a creditable proof of the progress made in the United States since the war in sobriety of thought and discussion that the grotesque idea of our repeating England's flagrant breach of her neutral duties, and letting loose a "fleet of *Alabamas*" to prey on the commerce of a friendly nation, appears to be of British or Russian rather than American growth. There are several difficulties in the way of any more "fleets of *Alabamas*." In the first place, at the time of the Declaration of Paris our Government refused to agree to the announcement of the great Powers that privateering "is and remains abolished," not because it approved of privateering, but because it desired to go further and protect even belligerent commerce. Since that time we have learnt to our cost what a "fleet of *Alabamas*" means; we have seen our commerce swept from the seas by one, and we have exacted a heavy fine from the nation which was the cause of our losses. That now, only twenty-two years since the signing of the Declaration, it should be tacitly assumed by anybody that, in case of a war between two nations with whom we are on the most friendly terms, the only thing that will make us, a neutral nation, refrain, not from issuing letters of marque to defend our own interests, but from making use of them to harass one belligerent for the benefit of the other, will be brute force, shows that our position must in certain quarters be much misunderstood. It would, of course, for the United States of all nations be an infamous piece of wickedness to do what England did in our Rebellion. That we should be supposed capable of anything of the sort, particularly after our loud talk about the duties of neutrals at the time of the *Alabama* dispute, is a curious illustration of the survival of foreign conceptions as to American qualities and tendencies long after the facts out of which the conceptions grew have ceased to have any existence. That Russia, in case of war, would only be prevented from resorting to privateering either by the impossibility of getting ships or the difficulty of disposing of her prizes, seems to be taken for granted. The idea that Russia would refrain from privateering as an obsolete and barbarous method of warfare has not suggested itself to any one. But Russia is actually a party to the Declaration of Paris, and

therefore is bound, if that Declaration means anything, to refuse to issue letters of marque. In recent discussions, however, in the English Parliament, it has been urged that the Declaration of Paris is of no binding authority, and that in case of a general war it will not be treated as having any. As we have before pointed out in these columns, Europe in 1856, looking forward to a long period of peace, abolished privateering in the interest of commerce; now, armed to the teeth, and every nation regarding its belligerent as of more importance than its commercial rights, it begins to look back at privateering with regret—particularly in the case of governments which contemplate the possibility of war with commercial nations. This change of feeling is perhaps natural in Europe, but an analysis of its causes ought to show the Russians how little reason they have to expect a similar change of feeling in this country. We may look forward to a long period of peace and prosperity; we have no great standing armies and no foreign quarrels. That we should sigh for the good old times when privateers ravaged the high seas, and long to plunge ourselves into a European quarrel by helping one friendly nation to resort to them against another, would be little less than madness.

But as it seems to be fancied abroad that all moral notions on the subject of our conduct in a European war are "played out," and that expediency and interest are alone to govern us, it is worth while to enquire what our legal position as a neutral will be—what will be our rights and duties as established by the law of nations and by treaty. Here, at the outset, we are confronted by a somewhat anomalous state of things, such as, we believe, has hardly ever presented itself before. As to both belligerents, we should of course be neutral; but in addition to our neutral duties as regulated by the ordinary principles of international law, there are also our obligations as defined by the Treaty of Washington. Between these two there is a considerable difference, although at the time of the *Alabama* controversy we maintained that there was none. By the general rules of international law a neutral's duties are defined very aptly by the word "neutrality" itself. The neutral must not in any way become a party to the war, and must not give assistance to either party. Its commerce is not to be interfered with, and it may, therefore, supply either belligerent with food and other products, subject to the right of capture in the case of contraband of war. These rules, accordingly, would govern the conduct of American citizens in their dealings with England in case of a war between that country and Russia.

Our behavior, however, would have to be regulated also by the Treaty of Washington, since that instrument provided that the "three rules" on the subject of neutral duties should be binding as between the Governments of England and the United States not only in the *Alabama* case but in the future as well. The Treaty stipulated, it will be remembered, that Great Britain and the United States should bring these rules to the notice of other governments and urge their general adoption; but, unfortunately, owing to the fact that Mr. Fish and the British Secretary for Foreign Affairs never could agree upon the meaning of the rules, no progress has been made in advancing their general adoption. And this is certainly not singular when we examine their nature. The three rules declare that a neutral government is bound to use "due diligence" to "prevent the fitting out, arming, or equipping within its jurisdiction" of any vessel which it has "reasonable ground to believe" is "intended" for use against a power with which it is at peace; to use "due diligence," also, to prevent a like employment if the vessel has been "specially adapted in whole or in part" to "warlike use"; that it is bound not to permit either belligerent to use its ports or waters as "the base of naval operations" or "for the purpose of the renewal or augmentation of military supplies or arms, or the recruitment of men"; further, that it is bound to use "due diligence" in its own ports and waters, and as to all persons within its jurisdiction, to prevent any violation of these obligations.

It is needless to point out the extreme stringency of these regulations. It was felt by England to be so great that she refused to agree in the Treaty that at the time of the escape of the *Alabama* they

formed any part of international law. Under these rules, taken in connection with the interpretation given them at Geneva by the American "case," and by the arguments of the American counsel, Mr. Evarts and Mr. Cushing, the United States is bound, as regards Great Britain, practically to watch every vessel that there is the slightest reason to suspect is being fitted out in any of our ports for warlike use against England, and to prevent its putting to sea at all hazards. Further than this, if, in order to stop her, new laws are needed, or even new constitutional amendments, the Government is bound to have such laws or constitutional amendments adopted at its peril. If a conflict arises between State and Federal jurisdiction, and our courts decide that the Federal jurisdiction is wanting, so much the worse for us, for under the Treaty of Washington no defence of this sort arising out of the peculiarities of municipal law can be set up. In the eyes of international law as expounded by that Treaty, the duty of neutrality is one of nearly absolute obligation, and cannot be avoided by the fact that the neutral has not provided the legislative or constitutional machinery for enforcing it. We may be of opinion, like Mr. Bumble, that if the law says this "the law is a hass," but that will make no difference; neither international law, nor treaties carrying it into effect, can be changed except by the consent of both parties; and we may be very sure that, in case of a war such as now threatens Europe, it will not be England which will endeavor to have the Treaty of Washington rescinded.

At the first blush, therefore, it would appear that, in case of a war between England and Russia, our duties toward one belligerent would be governed by a different law from that governing our duties to the other; that with regard to Russia our obligations would be those generally recognized as forming a part of the law of nations; that with regard to England our duties would be drawn from the more stringent rules of the Treaty of Washington; that the vessel which we should be obliged to stop if destined to cruise against English commerce, we need not stop at all if it could be made out that she was to be used in any way against Russia. Of course, this particular dilemma would not be likely to arise, because England would not be likely to be in need of American privateers. But it might easily arise with regard to some other obligation covered by the Treaty; as, for example, the recruitment of men in our ports. In this way we should be brought face to face with the question, Can there be a neutrality with different degrees of obligations to the two belligerents? If there can, we should have something like a practical illustration of what Count Bernstorff called "benevolent neutrality." Our neutrality would (at any rate in its practical results) be extremely "benevolent" as regarded England, and very much the opposite as regarded Russia. But it seems very clear that such a neutrality is out of the question. The very term imports an absolute equality of treatment of both belligerents, and consequently any obligations which we admit to exist in the case of the one must exist in the case of the other. It follows from this that our neutral obligations with regard to Russia will be precisely the same as those with regard to England, and will be defined not only by international law, but by international law as modified by the Treaty of Washington.

It is needless to point out the gravity of the responsibilities which will attach to our Government under the three rules. It is fortunate that we have in Mr. Evarts a Secretary of State whose connection with the Geneva arbitration must have made him fully alive to the magnitude of the responsibility they throw on the country. So far from its being true, as many persons suppose, that in case of a war Russia will be able to furnish a "fleet of *Alabamas*" from our ports and sweep English commerce from the seas, nothing is more unlikely. Our Government will, on the contrary, have to devote a great part of its energies to doing police work for Great Britain, and we think it quite safe to say that not a single privateer equipped "in whole or in part" for "warlike use" will get to sea from an American port. Since the Treaty of Washington we have, for good or evil, abandoned our old position as the champion of neutrality, and under the "three rules" may be considered as the leading protector of belligerent rights. Morally, it cannot but be a

cause of satisfaction to reflect that the position we took in order to win the *Alabama* case will now force our Government to prevent its citizens from gratifying their predatory instincts in defiance of law and the good opinion of mankind.

THE ENGLISH LIBERALS AND THEIR LEADERS.

AN article of Mr. Goldwin Smith's in the last number of the *Fortnightly Review*, entitled "Whigs and Liberals," though it may not be an authorized expression of Liberal opinion, gives vent to the growing feeling of discontent in the Radical wing of the Liberal party with the manner in which it is led or represented by its chiefs of the Conservative wing. This discontent has been growing ever since Mr. Gladstone went out of office, but it has been greatly stimulated by the management, or rather mismanagement, of party interests in the House of Commons during the Turco-Russian crisis. The precipitate retreat of Lord Hartington, Mr. Forster, and Lord Granville on the vote of the six millions, under the influence of sham news from Mr. Layard at Constantinople, and the general feebleness and indecision which have characterized their course on the whole question of war or peace, have, even if justified by facts, had naturally a most demoralizing influence on the rank and file of the party out of doors. It has become, too, among the Whigs or "gentlemanly" Liberals the fashion to join the Tories in abuse and repudiation of Mr. Gladstone, and to pretend that the party is well rid of him, and ought to disclaim all responsibility for him, and yet it is none the less true that nobody in the Liberal party has retained the hold he has over the mass of voters, or has been as faithful to the really great party traditions. It was due to his eloquence and activity, and to the strong popular confidence in the purity of his character, that the connection of England with the Turks was finally broken before the beginning of the war, and that all talk of England's fighting for the integrity and independence of the Turkish Empire was made impossible even for Lord Beaconsfield. Mr. Gladstone forced the Conservatives, in fact, into a tact dropping of the Turks, in spite of their keen sympathy with them, and obliged them to disguise their philo-Turkish schemes in clamor about "British interests" and in abuse of Russia. But with "British interests" and abuse of Russia they have, owing to the half-hearted conduct of the Liberal leaders in Parliament, been able to carry the day, in spite of the opposition, as Mr. S. Laing well says, "of a large proportion of the best intellect and conscience of the country."

This half-heartedness of the Whigs, as Mr. Goldwin Smith would call it, is due to what may be termed their "gentlemanliness," or their sympathy with the large and powerful body of wealthy persons, and the connections of wealthy persons, beginning with the Queen and stopping at the shopkeepers, who form what for political purposes is called "society." It is by no means a homogeneous body, and contains many grades and circles from the court down, who do not mingle freely, the upper one being a kind of Plevna, on which the others make incessant assaults, and such of the assailants as get inside the works ineffectually help to man them against their old comrades. But their intestine dissensions about "position" do not prevent substantial unity in political feeling, especially on questions of foreign politics; and to appreciate the force of this unity one has to remember that "society" has increased enormously in numbers and wealth within the last thirty years; that to the old landed aristocracy has been added the great commercial class which made fortunes in trade and industry since the passage of the Reform Bill, and whose fondest desire is to be at one in manners and feeling with the older court circle. The sensitiveness of this body of persons—the like of which no other country has to show—to influences from above is very great and is cultivated in every possible way, so that the gentlemanly view of any current topic of the day travels through its ranks like an electric shock; and when its influence is thrown in one direction it forms a very powerful political force. How near it came, in spite of the strong moral and religious and economical forces which the North

had on its side, to driving England into some kind of physical support of the South during the late war, is fresh in everybody's memory, and this in spite of the fact that the Queen, in so far as her bereavement allowed her to show any interest in the matter, on the whole was on the side of the North. In the present case the Queen is very well understood to be intensely anti-Russian, doubtless largely owing to the fact that Prince Albert was much embittered against the Russians during and after the Crimean War, and it probably now seems to her disrespectful to his memory to revise his opinions, even in view of a great change in the facts of the situation. The publication, from his private papers, of his invectives against Russia written over twenty years ago, in his *Memoirs* by Mr. Theodore Martin, coupled with the recent royal visit to the bellicose Premier, was well understood to indicate that Russia was considered in court circles a desperate and wicked power.

Society was already fully in the mood to adopt this view owing to the gallantry of the Turkish resistance. It had been a little cowed by the undeniable atrocity of the Turkish modes of repressing insurrection; but when Osman Pasha began to hold his own against the whole Russian army it threw aside all restraint, and made no secret of the feeling, which is always current or latent in the clubs and at dinner-tables in great houses, that a great deal must be pardoned to a landholding class which fights well and has to do with dependents who are cowardly and submissive. The piles of women's and children's heads blackening in the sun at Batak were an ugly fact, but, after all, the defenders of Plevna were "fine fellows" and ought to be let alone. This feeling reached at one time the point of burlesque, after the fall of the place. There is not and never was any reason for supposing that Osman Pasha was in any way different from the other Pashas, except in having a better military eye and a more dogged courage. But the philo-Turk imagination, after working on him for a couple of months, made him a sensitive, high-spirited gentleman of the Bayard and Sidney type, so that when the *Daily Telegraph* published a false report of his having committed suicide after his surrender the *Pall Mall Gazette* swallowed it whole, and then, commenting on it, showed how natural it was that so noble a soul should find the degradation of captivity in the hands of such coarse, vulgar people as the Russians intolerable, and death by his own hand a welcome escape. Osman, however, has lived on comfortably, and is now a warm friend at Constantinople of a Turco-Russian alliance, and must smile at hearing that it was supposed by his English friends that he would sooner die than endure the company or civility of a Grand Duke.

The effect of this separation of the Whig element in the Liberal party from the rank and file is, however, likely in the long run to work considerable mischief, the full extent of which we doubt if the Radical leaders fully perceive. Whig leadership, if timid and slow, and in times like these too gentlemanly for common use, has had the great merit of making Liberal politics both thoughtful and cautious, and of giving the party management to men who got it with so much ease that they had time for the study of questions and for careful legislation. There is a strong disposition now to substitute for this management the caucus system, and in fact the substitution has been begun under the auspices of Mr. Chamberlain and other Radical leaders; and this disposition is, of course, greatly stimulated by the division of the party on the Turco-Russian difficulty. "The formation," Mr. Goldwin Smith says, "of a more distinct party of thoroughgoing Liberals would necessarily be accompanied by a corresponding change in the character and bearing of its members. They would find it necessary to stand more decidedly apart from the court and the aristocracy, and to give their followers the guarantee, and to themselves the moral force, of unquestionable independence. They would also find it necessary in selecting their own leaders to look less to oratoric powers and more to powers of action." We fear, however, that in making this change the Radicals will fall into the error under which this country is now groaning, of creating, in lieu of the leadership of aristocrats or persons closely connected with the court and the aristocracy, an elaborate nominating machinery the management of

which will wholly absorb the time of working politicians, and leave them none for their proper business. Such a change as this England could not support as the United States supports it. Her political fabric is too complicated, and too delicate, to permit with impunity the absorption of the most active minds of the country in the business of electioneering. The English Liberals enjoy at this moment the great advantage of knowing whom to blame for what they do not like. With the caucus in good working order, the fixing of responsibility would become increasingly difficult, and the separation between "politics" and public business rapid and wide.

ENGLAND DRIFTING INTO WAR.

LONDON, April 5, 1878.

ON the 29th of February, 1876, or more than two years ago, I hazarded a criticism in one of my letters to the *Nation* upon the dispositions and tendencies of the members of our present Cabinet which I venture to repeat. It was in these words:

"Lord Salisbury and Mr. Disraeli are the men of strong will and dangerous determinations in the Ministry. Lord Derby means well, and would be honest if he could. But he is not a far-seeing man; neither is he courageous. He is like Lord Aberdeen in the Crimean Cabinet, and would follow, protesting and vacillating, where the stronger spirits lead. Mr. Gathorne Hardy is of that impetuous temperament that would make him follow also after what he would be told was the 'Imperial instinct.' Mr. Ward Hunt will probably have to leave them soon. The Duke of Richmond, the Earl of Malmesbury, and Lord John Manners are of no account. There remain but four men in the Cabinet who have wills of their own. Lord Cairns would in all probability incline towards the stronger natures, and Sir Stafford Northcote could be persuaded to move reluctantly where they lead. Mr. Cross, the nominee and friend of Lord Derby, is a man of some character and independence, but he has no knowledge of foreign affairs, and has neither political reputation nor official experience to warrant him in asserting his own opinion against that of his colleagues. There is only one man in the Cabinet who could be trusted to take a decided line apart from Mr. Disraeli and Lord Salisbury, and he is the present Colonial Secretary, Lord Carnarvon. He is a man of strict integrity and good judgment, and one who thinks for himself. So long as he remains in the Cabinet, it is unlikely that any fatal mistake will be made. But he may leave his colleagues, as he did in 1867. If he was gone, and the popularity of the Ministry was waning, I should be sorry to think of the difficulties and troubles into which we might be precipitated by the eccentric vanity of Mr. Disraeli and the arrogant wrong-headedness of Lord Salisbury, acting upon a public opinion which they, with the aid of a portion of the press, had stimulated and excited into a 'longing for action' and a desire for an 'extension' of the empire, whether in India or nearer home."

It is curious to look back now upon these two years and two months and to see how far we have advanced in the direction foreshadowed two years ago. Before this letter reaches you "the difficulties and troubles into which this nation has been precipitated" may be close upon us. The changes in the Cabinet suggested in that extract have taken place. Mr. Ward Hunt has left them, though not in the manner anticipated. Lord Malmesbury has been changed for the Duke of Northumberland. But that is merely the change of a dumb dog for a dog that cannot bark. Lord Carnarvon has resigned and has washed his hands of all responsibility, and has now taken up an attitude of hostility to his late colleagues. Lord Derby, "protesting and vacillating," followed the stronger spirits until they felt themselves powerful enough to do without him, and then they intrigued him out of the Cabinet, and now even such ballast as his caution and his dogged dread of war gave them has been thrown overboard. True they have got his brother, Captain Stanley, on board instead. But though clearer-headed than Lord Derby, and a man perhaps of firmer nerve, he is not old enough or strong enough to hold his own in the Cabinet. He has gone to the War Office, where he simply will become an animated registering machine of the Duke of Cambridge, the Commander-in-Chief, and a subservient instrument of the Prime Minister. Two other names are added to the Cabinet, Sir Michael Beach, the Colonial Secretary, and Mr. Smith, the First Lord of the Admiralty. The former is an amiable baronet with a gracious manner, and very little else. The latter is a bookseller of accurate business habits and a turn for details, but of no sort of personal influence or authority to remove a featherweight out of his own department. We are, therefore, handed over, tied hand and foot, to the two men "of strong will and dangerous determination" in the Cabinet—Mr. Disraeli, now Lord Beaconsfield, and Lord Salisbury. And what makes our position the more anxious is this, that whereas two years ago war, or even warlike preparations, was as remote from the contemplation of the people as it had been at any time during the last quarter of a century, to-day the peace

party is as helpless and impotent to restrain the warlike tendencies of the noisier and more thoughtless sections of the nation as it was in the Crimean War. To the great bulk of the Liberal party throughout the country the idea of war on any pretext that has yet been suggested is hateful. But they cannot move. The "Rule Britannia" spirit has taken possession of the body of the nation, and you may as well argue with a fire raging in a house and explain that it will be much better for it that it should not burn the house, as argue with "Rule Britannia." It has all come upon us so gradually and consistently. We have been educated, first, that it would be unpatriotic to divide the nation, then that it would be uncourageous to submit to Russian supremacy in the East; then, that it would be foolish to be duped any longer by Russian diplomacy; now our emotions have been excited by the publication of the Rumanian protest, and by the hectoring ingratitude of Prince Gortchakoff towards a nation which we believe saved the Russian arms from disgrace at Plevna; and, finally, we have been brought to think that the best chance for peace is to show a united front, and to support the Government when now, at the eleventh hour, they have begun to give some indication of a definite policy—however false we may consider that policy to be. And thus step by step, by indirect appeals, partly to their generosity, partly to their reason, the Liberal party have been induced to abandon their opposition to a war, and both they and the country at large have become habituated to the prospect of our being engaged before long in what may prove the most exhausting and destructive struggle of this century.

The collapse of the Liberal resolve commenced last session when the debate on the Gladstone resolutions broke down. It was strengthened early in this session when the right centre broke away from the more exacting left on the Forster amendment on the vote of credit; and now, on the address to the Crown thanking her Majesty for calling out the reserves, even the ghost of an opposition will have vanished. A rump of some forty or fifty irreconcilables, possibly a few more, may divide upon the question whether the emergency to meet which the reserves are to be called out is or is not sufficiently critical to justify the resolution. But the acknowledged leaders of the party, including Mr. Gladstone and Mr. Bright, have acquiesced in the determination that any organized opposition should cease. They do not see that there is any great emergency, but they throw the responsibility of the situation upon the Cabinet. It is a strange commentary upon popular government to contrast the difference in tone and disposition in this country at the time of the St. James's Hall Conference, eighteen months ago, with what it is to-day. I remember being much struck with a remark made by a political friend of mine on the evening of the Conference. We had both attended it in a critical rather than a sympathetic mood, and my friend said, with something of regret, "It seems to me impossible, after such a demonstration as this, that this country can ever go to war again; no war party could ever excite the industrial classes as the body in St. James's Hall were excited. England will never see another war." I thought the statement bold, but under the temporary influence of the moment I acquiesced in his view. Now I recognize with Burns that

"The best laid schemes o' mice and men
Gang aft a-gley."

and that the difficulty of the moment is not to make war, but to keep the peace. The great Mississippi of philanthropic and pacific emotion which poured over the whole country and penetrated every household from one end of England to the other, eighteen months ago, has dried up and shrunk into the dimensions of the runnel of a private irrigation scheme promoted by Sir Wilfred Lawson and one or two others, whose patriotism is inspired as much by the personal vanity of appearing to be peculiar as by any higher virtue. We are not, it is true, actually in the war; and there are men among us who still cling to the hope that Russia will yield, and that some peaceful solution may be found. Our instinct, they say, tells us that we shall not fight, though our reason may speak the other way. Until the first cannon shot has been fired we will not believe that it has come to this. One can only hope that these optimist views may prove true, and that war may yet be averted. But this can only be brought about by concessions being made by Russia which only the most sanguine among us believe that a proud country will make.

As to the result, if war should unhappily break out, I am bound to say that no one whom I have met shows much apprehension. If England were allied with Austria we feel assured that Russia could not maintain her present position. Instead of "Beati possidentes," the refrain of the song would more likely be "Miseri possidentes." Russia has gone too

far for her own safety. The facility with which she brought the Turks to terms would be her destruction. The British fleet could destroy her communications by sea. A hostile army marching upon her flank through Croatia and Servia on the one side of the Danube, and through Transylvania on the other, with a flotilla of gunboats operating on the Danube, combined with a hostile Rumania in her rear, would come near to the practical destruction of the army in Bulgaria and Rumelia. The Russian position would be untenable. But, to speak frankly, we do not count upon the Austrian alliance, and even without it we believe that this country could so far exhaust Russia that she would have to come to terms in time. A protracted war carried on with a view to material exhaustion on one side or the other is almost more painful to contemplate than a short, sharp, and decisive struggle like the Austro-Prussian war. But a war of exhaustion is the only war which this country can undertake against Russia, and of the two countries England is much more capable of standing a prolonged strain upon her resources than Russia. We never were so strong materially as we are at present. The capacity for taxation is practically unlimited. There would be much grumbling, much discomfort, some poverty, even some misery. But the boast that we could undertake three or even four campaigns without feeling seriously the effects is not without foundation. Neither should we be at a loss for men if they were wanted. In India alone the supply of men from among the fighting tribes—men who, led by British officers, would make excellent soldiers—is almost inexhaustible. And there is nothing that these tribes would more enjoy than an energetic struggle with a white race at the cost of another white race. At home, too, there are multitudes of men ready and willing to enlist if they are required—many of them who have already had the advantage of some elementary training. As it is, recruiting has gone on actively for some weeks back, and men are pouring into the ranks more actively than at any time since before the outbreak of the Crimean war. There will be no lack of men. But the difficulty that all of us who are not inclined to rush blindly over the precipice cannot solve is this, For what definite object is the war to be undertaken? We want none of the Turkish territory; we have no more call to share in the partition of Turkey than we had to share in the partition of Poland; we do not want to lay in a stock of military glory; we cannot see that our interests are assailed. It may be true that Russian influence will be greatly extended over the east of Europe and over Asia Minor if the treaty of San Stefano be permitted to stand. There are many among us who regret to see the extension of a scientific despotism such as Russia over countries which ought to flourish under free institutions, and we consider that this has been brought about largely by the almost wilful blindness of our present rulers. But it is not our exclusive affair. Austria and Germany have as much to lose as we shall have. Why, then, should we rush into a quixotic enterprise and engage in an exhausting and perhaps horrible war for the protection of interests which, where they are not imaginary, are the interests of other Powers rather than our own?

JAMES'S 'FRENCH POETS AND NOVELISTS.'

PARIS, April 5, 1878.

IT is said that the judgment of foreigners is the judgment of posterity; it is calm, it is disinterested, it is devoid of all the mixture which personal passions and which fashion are too apt to introduce into criticism. Is it possible for Prince Napoleon to judge Victor Hugo? for the Duc de Broglie to judge Renan? for Bishop Dupanloup to judge Alexandre Dumas? We are apt to feel too subjectively about our contemporaries. It is curious to compare the judgments passed on Henri IV. by such men as D'Aubigné, as Madame de Rohan, as the Duc de Bouillon, with the impartial judgment of history. We ought, therefore, to feel much obliged to those among foreigners who take the trouble to give a studied and elaborate opinion of our writers of the day. I have read with the greatest interest and pleasure the volume just published by Henry James, Jr., on 'French Poets and Novelists.' It is, I believe, the first time that an American writer of distinction has made a profound analysis of our modern French literature. This analysis is still incomplete, as Mr. James speaks only of Alfred de Musset, of Théophile Gautier, of Charles Baudelaire, of Honoré de Balzac, of George Sand, of Charles de Bernard and Gustave Flaubert, of Mérimée. There is no study yet of Victor Hugo, of Lamartine, of Alexandre Dumas the father, of Alexandre Dumas the son, but Mr. James has shown himself extremely competent to accomplish a critical *tableau* of all our contemporary literature. He is himself a novelist, a man of great imagination, and therefore it is quite natural that he should devote himself more especially to

the poets and the novelists. Thus far he has not occupied himself with our great critics, nor even with our dramatists; his partiality to novelists has even induced him to give a place to Ivan Turgeneff among our own writers. We have, it is true, quite adopted Turgeneff in Paris, and in a certain way he has adopted us; his works are no sooner written in Russian than they are translated into French. But he is essentially a Slav; his body is in France, his mind is always dwelling on the great plains of Holy Russia; his imagination is wandering in that chaotic world which is now in commotion, and out of which something yet unknown will come forth that will alter the face of Europe.

As a Frenchman I ought at once to thank Mr. James for a certain tone of sympathy which runs through all his volume. He does not scold France in that harsh manner which has sometimes been adopted by foreigners. He has seen us in our misfortunes, fallen from our ancient glory, and he evidently feels that this is not the hour for adopting towards us the insolent tone of a Carlyle. He cannot, however, help showing at times the puritanic instincts of a well-bred inhabitant of New England. His essay on Alfred de Musset is really admirable. It is, in my opinion, the best of the series; but his severity towards Musset can hardly be restrained by his admiration. He finds the muse of Musset a little too warm, but those of Byron and of Thomas Moore were surely not colder. Musset was extremely young when he wrote the 'Contes d'Espagne et d'Italie,' and Mr. James is a little hard on these "Andalusian passions." "From our modest Anglo-Saxon point of view," he says, "these same 'Andalusian passions,' dealing chiefly with ladies tumbling about on disordered couches, and pairs of lovers who take refuge from an exhausted vocabulary in *biting* each other, are an odd sort of thing for an ingenuous lad." Perhaps I could find my answer to this in some lines of Musset:

"Celui qui ne sait pas durant les nuits brûlantes
Qui font pâlir d'amour l'étoile de Vénus," etc., etc.;

but it is needless to insist on such a point, as the criticisms of Mr. James are always light and, so to say, volatile when he speaks of our great poet. He does not walk on flowers.

His appreciation of Madame Sand is excellent; he does full justice to her manly activity, to her descriptive powers, to her style, to her extraordinary spontaneity, to the simplicity of her rich nature, to the frankness of her character. I don't know if Mr. James had occasion to see Madame Sand, for of late years she appeared very seldom in Paris, but he paints her exactly as she was—a very unostentatious, unambitious woman. She was all her life very simple, and what the French call *bon enfant*; she never attempted to be witty, and she was always extremely willing to hear *you* talk and not to talk herself. She must have been, even in her youth, very motherly in all her numerous love affairs; she probably never felt that passion of love to the description of which she devoted the great powers of her mind. But she always hated a complete solitude and wanted a friend, something to study, a speaking insect, a thinking butterfly, a thing in which she could study life and its complicated shades. It could almost be said that everything was good for a time in this respect, and nothing could satisfy the curiosity of her mind. Nature had made an error in giving her the wrong sex; she was intensely masculine in features, in humor, in character, in intellect. Mr. James, in noticing the first novels of Madame Sand—those in which she preaches the sanctity of passion and its legitimacy, superior to the legitimacy instituted by law—might have noticed the connection between these literary efforts and the preaching of the phalansterian school. The Phalanstère is now completely forgotten; nobody reads Fourier, Considérant, etc. The realistic school has given us something very different from the childish idyls of the phalansterians; we have ceased to believe in the "attraction passionnelle" and the "travail attrayant"; but at the time when Madame Sand made her debut the Phalanstère and its doctrines were in fashion; it had eloquent and amiable apostles, and Madame Sand knew them well. The new school has left the Eden where Madame Sand liked to dwell for the dry authors of the 'Madame Bovary' school, who, without being conscious moralists, show us the dangerous nature of passion. No Calvinistic preacher could be more convinced than M. Zola of the "total depravity" of men. Madame Sand was nursed in other ideas; her glory is one of the rays of the sun which shone upon France after the Revolution of 1830, when all was hope, when France convinced herself that she had become the leader of all nations, the land of liberty, of progress, of felicity—the Canaan of history.

Mr. James justly remarks the change which age produced in Madame Sand. As he says, hers "was a French mind, and as a French mind it had to theorize; but if the positive side of its criticism of most human

institutions was precipitate and ill-balanced, the error was in a great measure atoned for in later years. The last half of Madame Sand's career was a period of assent and acceptance." It was so not only socially, but politically; Madame Sand never had strong political passions; she was too sincere. She became Republican after 1848, and is said to have been the editor of an official *Bulletin de la République*, which made some noise at the time. Her enthusiasm for the Republicans was never very warm; she saw the men under the costume of the tribune, she fathomed Ledru-Rollin, she knew Pierre Leroux, she knew Barbès. Under the second Empire we find her almost intimate with Prince Napoleon, the Republican prince; he paid her visits at Nohant, she enjoyed his versatile and brilliant conversation. She did not hail with any joy the advent of the third Republic, and she profoundly mistrusted Gambetta. It is rather singular that, being such an optimist and so inclined to admire, she spoke very severely after the war of the balloon-born young dictator of Tours and Bordeaux.

We are afraid that posterity will show the truth of these melancholy remarks: "All the world can read George Sand once and not find it in the least hard. But it is not easy to return to her. Putting aside a number of fine descriptive pages, the reader will not be likely to resort to any volume that he has once laid down for a particular chapter, a brilliant passage, an entertaining conversation. George Sand invites re-perusal less than any mind of equal eminence." It is true. It is very difficult now to read 'Valentine' and 'Lélia,' and even 'Mauprat.' The life is out of it; we don't feel in harmony with the spirit which inspired these works. But such is the fate of many books. Who will not find it hard now to read the 'Nouvelle Héloïse'? Few are the novels which have in them the spring of eternal life.

Full justice has been done to Balzac by Mr. James. He remarks that the correspondence of Balzac, just partly published, has, on the whole, been favorable to the reputation of the great French novelist. Balzac can still be read, and probably will be for some time. It is because he really was a precursor, a prophet. He saw around himself the rudiments of the present society. His characters, his types, are intensely modern. It is clear that Mr. James is perfectly at home in the world of Balzac—in that complex company of the 'Comédie Humaine.' He speaks of all its members as if they were personal acquaintances; and, surely, was there ever anything as real as Rastignac, as Cousine Bette, as the Baron Hulot, as Cousin Pons, as all the saints or monsters of Balzac's invention? It is curious how this new world takes possession of the mind, how true it seems. It has the sort of intense reality which is still the privilege of the gods and the demi-gods of the Greek mythology. Is not Jupiter as real, more real, than so many men of flesh and blood who have passed through life as waves run over the surface of water? What is real—the organism or the passion? Does not Minerva sit at my side and comfort and console me, and look at me with those eyes which Homer has described? We are all like those hard warriors of the Scandinavian poems who went to war with invisible Valkyries over their heads. To describe the world of Balzac's invention is as difficult as to make an analysis of the 'Metamorphoses' of Ovid. Mr. James has, at any rate, drawn from his analysis a very just and very delicate delineation of Balzac. He has shown us the character of this extraordinary genius, so terrestrial and human in parts, so sublime in others; an epicurean ending in a saint—"desinit in piscem mulier formosa superne"; a skeptic and a stoic; a slave of the senses and a Jansenist at the same time; a curious marvel and wonder; the modern Rabelais, but a Rabelais fond of purity, a Christian Rabelais, who delights in nothing so much as in the idea of atonement, martyrdom, and endless sacrifice.

Mr. James has done an unmerited honor, I believe, to our modern French literature in praising, as he has done, the author of 'Madame Bovary.' 'Madame Bovary' has been but a shooting star. If M. Flaubert's novel goes down to posterity it will be because it will be illustrated, as it well deserves to be, with indecent engravings. It will be admired as we admire some poems of Dorat. I have never been able to admire this realistic history of the Fall transported to a vulgar Norman town. I find any number of the *Gazette des Tribunaux* quite as suggestive. Baudelaire has also been kindly treated by Mr. James; but Baudelaire wrote in verse, and half a dozen fine lines cover a multitude of sins. Who sins in prose cannot be pardoned. On the whole, Mr. James has shown in his volume such a comprehension of French literature that he ought to be invited to write something more than a succession of essays, something like the *Tableau* or *History of the French Literature of the Nineteenth Century*. He would, in doing so, render a service not only to the English and American, but to the French public.

Correspondence.

ADMISSION ON DIPLOMA TO THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION :

SIR : Professor C. K. Adams in his second letter, under the heading "President Eliot on Preliminary Examinations," as published in your issue of April 4, alleges, in the first place, that I have "ventured an opinion" concerning the Michigan method of receiving pupils from approved schools on diploma without adequate knowledge of the method; and, in the second place, he reaffirms the assumption on which his first letter was based—namely, that there is a very marked resemblance between the examinations conducted by the Oxford and Cambridge Schools Examination Board and the visitations of high-schools conducted by the University of Michigan. With your permission I respectfully invite your readers to a re-examination of each of these two points.

1. My information concerning the Michigan method of admission on school diplomas was derived from the official publications of the University—the proper source of authentic information. Since the date of my last letter I have received the Calendar for 1877-78, lately issued, and the President's Report for the year ending June 30, 1877. I ask attention to the following extracts from the latest Calendar and the last two Reports of the President, premising that the statement taken from the Calendar for 1877-78 is the same as that contained in the Calendar for 1876-77, from which I quoted in my last letter. The italics in these extracts are mine.

"A Committee of the Faculty will visit once every year any Public High-School in Michigan, on request of its School Board, and report its condition to the Faculty. If the Faculty shall be satisfied from such report that the school is taught by competent instructors, and is furnishing a good preparation for any one or more of our regular courses, then the graduates from such preparatory course or courses will be admitted to the Freshman class of the University *without examination*, and permitted to enter on such undergraduate course or courses as the approved preparatory work contemplated. They must present to the President, within three months after their graduation, the diplomas of their School Board, certifying that they have sustained their examinations in all the studies prescribed for admission to one of the three courses, Classic, Scientific, and Engineering, or Latin and Scientific. They will also be required to appear at once in their classes, otherwise they can be admitted only after examination. The privilege of *admission on diploma* is limited to public schools in Michigan, and their School Boards must make the application annually" (Calendar for 1877-78, p. 37).

"The plan of receiving students from certain approved high-schools on diploma and *without examination by us* has worked so satisfactorily that the Faculty have deemed it prudent and wise to offer to receive students on diploma from a class of high-schools whose graduates have heretofore been admitted by us *only on examination*. We have, until this year, declined to approve any school which was not so organized and equipped as to be able to prepare students simultaneously for all our undergraduate courses of study. But we now propose to approve any good high-school which can show that it is *thoroughly preparing students for any one of our classes*" (President's Report for the year ending June 30, 1876, p. 6).

"This system of receiving students from approved schools continues to justify itself. We take some students, it is true, who ought not to have been sent to us, and who prove incompetent to go on with the class. But we always take some such on examination. And if in any case a superintendent has been lax in scrutinizing the attainments of a pupil whom he has recommended to us, the dropping of the pupil from our class with a kind and frank statement of the facts to the superintendent has always proved a sufficient incentive to him to greater caution the next year. . . . The custom of receiving students *without examination* from approved schools is rapidly extending. Not only has it been adopted in some of the State universities of the West, but some of the Eastern colleges are receiving students *without examination from academies of established reputation*" (President's Report for the year ending June 30, 1877, p. 6).

These extracts give a complete, trustworthy, and clear account of the method under consideration. Their language could not be made plainer. I have not mistaken its meaning. Nobody could mistake its meaning. The Faculty satisfy themselves by an annual inspection that a given school is, in general, an efficient preparatory school; and then admit the pupils of that school to the Freshman class, without examination by the Faculty, on the certificate of the authorities of the school that such pupils have passed the *school examinations* for graduation in the subjects required for admission to the University.

In the face of these distinct official statements Professor Adams says: "Everybody in Michigan would understand that the expression 'without examination by us' (italicized in the above extract from President Angell's report for 1876) means without examination *at the University*," there-

by implying that these certificated pupils are admitted, not on their diplomas, but on some prior examination by the University. I submit that Professor Adams's construction of President Angell's language is manifestly incorrect, and that the implication in his remark—an implication essential to his argument—is utterly misleading. There is no prior examination of these individual pupils by the Faculty, or a committee thereof, in any proper sense of the term. In this connection I invite the special attention of your readers to the following sentence, which occurs near the end of Professor Adams's second letter: "Of course there is a sense in which Harvard, or any other university, partially surrenders its authority when it allows a committee of its own number to determine whether a boy shall be admitted to its classes." In this sentence Professor Adams again conveys by implication to his readers the erroneous impression that the visiting committees of the University of Michigan determine by examination whether certain *persons* shall be admitted to its classes. The committees do no such thing. They visit a school and (in the language of the Calendar) "report its condition to the Faculty." They advise the Faculty whether or not certain schools had better be permitted to pass their pupils into the University without examination on their school diplomas. The gist of the Michigan method is that the Faculty, by vote, annually approve certain schools, after an annual inspection thereof, and then receive the pupils of those schools on their school diplomas. On the extra-official theory of Professor Adams the responsibility of the school superintendent, on which President Angell dwells, would be imaginary, and the "privilege of admission on diploma," of which the Calendar speaks as limited to public schools in Michigan, would be wholly nugatory.

Throughout his letters Professor Adams uses the word examination in a sense very different from that in which I use it, and from that in which it is used by the English universities—in a sense, indeed, so vague and slippery as to give great opportunity for misconception and unintentional misrepresentation. It is obvious that the general efficiency of a school cannot be ascertained without some enquiry into the attainments of the pupils; so that the researches of the committee which visits a school necessarily include some direct observation of the attainments of the scholars, or some examination of the individual scholars in Professor Adams's sense of the word. The scope and method of this enquiry may be more conveniently explained under my second head.

2. Professor Adams maintains that, at these visits of a committee of the Faculty to Michigan schools, examinations are held which are "similar" to the examinations of the Oxford and Cambridge Schools Examination Board. He says "that there is a resemblance, and that the resemblance is very marked." Now, the official publications of the University leave no doubt in the mind of the reader as to the method of procedure at these visits, but still do not supply the means of comparing that method, point by point, with the method of the English Board. On the 5th of April I therefore addressed to President Angell a series of enquiries concerning these visits of inspection, and yesterday received from him a very clear and circumstantial reply. I am thus indebted largely to his courtesy for the means of setting this subject before your readers in its true light.

To clear the ground, I must be permitted to recall the fact that the English Board holds two kinds of examinations: 1, examinations of schools for the benefit of the schools exclusively, and having no effect to admit individuals to the universities, or to exempt them from subsequent examinations, whether at the universities or elsewhere; 2, examinations of individuals for certificates which give exemption from the entrance examinations at Oxford and Cambridge, from the earliest examinations of the University course, and from the preliminary examinations of certain professional bodies. (See the *Nation*, No. 665, p. 211.) It is only the second sort of examinations with which this discussion has any concern. Professor Adams has not observed this distinction—a fact which proves that he has never read with care the documents which describe the proceedings of the Oxford and Cambridge Board. He quotes as follows from my first letter, the bracketed interjections being his: "The examinations of schools [in England] are held at the schools [so they are in Michigan], upon request of the school desiring to be examined [the same in Michigan], and exclusively for its benefit [the same in Michigan] and at its expense [the same in Michigan]." Now, this ingenious assertion of similarity, satisfactory and conclusive as it seems at first sight, has in reality no bearing whatever upon the subject under discussion. The statement is in fact grossly inaccurate; but, accurate or inaccurate, it is wholly irrelevant. In quoting my sentence Professor Adams stopped at a semicolon; if he had quoted the rest of the sentence,

as follows: "and these examinations have, in themselves, no effect whatever to admit pupils of the examined schools to the universities, either with or without testimonials or diplomas given by the school," the reader would have perceived that Professor Adams was not discussing the real question at issue. The present discussion concerns examinations for admission to colleges or universities, and none other.

We are now ready to compare in detail the English examinations for certificates with the Michigan visits to schools, as regards their methods of procedure, bearing it distinctly in mind the while that the objects in view in the two cases are different—the exclusive object of the English examinations being to test the attainments of persons, while the object of the Michigan visits is to test the efficiency of schools. (a) The English examinations cover thirty-four different and carefully-specified subjects (no candidate taking the whole), and on the average two hours are allowed for writing answers to the questions in each subject; the examinations last twelve days, and are held three times in the year; and the schedule of days, subjects, and hours for each year is published nearly a year in advance. The Michigan visits occupy from one to two days at each school, and occur once a year at each inspected school. (b) In England the decision of the Board is always upon the individual—has he passed a satisfactory examination in a sufficient number of subjects?—and the Board takes no account whatever of the opinions or certificates of school authorities concerning the individual. In Michigan the decision is upon the school—shall the Faculty accept the certificate of the authorities of the school to the attainments of their pupils in lieu of a personal examination? (c) In England a printed report is annually made by the Board showing the name of each person who obtained a certificate, the subjects in which he satisfied the examiners, and the school from which he came. In Michigan no record is made by the visiting committee of the standing of individual scholars; the committee makes an oral report to the Faculty upon the condition of the school inspected, and the Faculty then vote to accept the school or not. (d) The English examinations are conducted in writing for all the subjects, but for a few subjects oral examinations are superadded. The questions are printed; they are the same for every candidate in any given subject; and they are made public when the examinations are over. The Michigan examinations (so-called) are exclusively oral, and are therefore different for every school and for every individual. They have no uniform, exact, or public standard. I should have no occasion to dispute the proposition, should it be made, that oral examinations may be real and useful examinations. The question before us is whether the English methods are similar to the Michigan methods. Now, there is no more important difference of method in examination than this difference between written and oral examinations, for the consequences of this difference are many and grave. Indeed, two examinations, or methods of examination, which differ in this essential respect, cannot properly be called similar at all, particularly when, as in the case under discussion, the objects of the two examinations are different—the one being the examination of individuals, the other of schools. (e) In order to secure uniformity of standard at the English examinations, the results obtained at the different places of examination are compared by the Central Board of Examiners, in order that the certificates given by the Board may have a definite value. In Michigan it may be a different committee that visits each different school. (f) In England each candidate pays a fee of £2, and from these fees each examiner is liberally paid for every day of service spent in setting questions, attending the examinations, and looking over the answers of candidates. In Michigan the school pays the hotel and travelling expenses of the visiting committee, while the University pays for the committee's time, and the pupils of the schools pay nothing. These pecuniary details strongly mark the different attitudes of the two examining authorities.

There are other significant points of difference between the English and the Michigan methods; but it must be already obvious to your readers that to call these two methods of procedure similar is to abuse language and to mislead the uninformed.

Professor Adams, in his second letter, controverts my opinion that "the Michigan method is a partial surrender of the authority of the University." I respectfully decline to discuss that subject with him. It is a subject on which opinions may reasonably differ, and nothing but experience can determine which opinion is the sounder. The next twenty years may, or may not, supply that experience. At present Professor Adams and I hold different opinions, and doubtless we both value the privilege of changing our opinions for reasons which seem to us good.

Your obedient servant,

CHARLES W. ELIOT.

CAMBRIDGE, MASS., April 19, 1878.

Notes.

WHAT constitutes Bulgaria? was a question often asked at the outbreak of the war in the East, but never satisfactorily answered. The Bulgaria of the "Preliminary Treaty of Peace," however, is a very definite territory, and its boundaries, as laid down in the treaty, are shown in a map which accompanies the *Geographical Magazine* for April (John Wiley & Sons). It includes not only Salonika but the railroad destined to connect that port with Belgrade; not only Philippopolis but a position between the River Tekke and Tchoru which commands the railroad between Constantinople and Adrianople. Serbia is increased by about a fifth, Montenegro by two-thirds; and the two countries are brought so close together that the Turkish highway from Albania to Bosnia can be shut up without difficulty when the time comes. In the same number of this magazine is a map showing the new French explorations for a ship-canal across the isthmus of Darien, as well as the longer, more difficult, and more costly route surveyed by Commander Selfridge, U.S.N., whose labors, however, were of the greatest service to Lieut. Wyse.—No. 70 of the Proceedings of the American Antiquarian Society is valuable for Dr. Charles Deane's discussion of the convention between Gates and Burgoyne as to the shipment of the latter's troops to England on parole; an agreement not fulfilled by Congress, whose acts, in Dr. Deane's judgment, were "not marked by the highest exhibition of good policy or of good faith."—A page of "Rules aiming at uniformity in writing and printing German with Latin letters, together with a few changes in spelling, already generally adopted," to which is added a page of illustrations, has been issued by Prof. H. C. G. Brandt, of Johns Hopkins University, and C. F. Raddatz, of the Baltimore City College.—The Tauchnitz 'New Dictionary of the English and Latin Languages' (Henry Holt & Co.) has the handiness of the well-known series to which it belongs, and is typographically pleasing to the eye and easy of reference. It is, of course, an abridgment, filling only 400 pages, in two parts.—A correspondent of the *Milan Perseveranza* states that General La Marmora's literary remains consist of a few fragments of studies on the passage of Hannibal into Italy, on the origin of the La Marmora family, on the September Convention, etc.; and the second part of the famous 'Un po' più di luce.' This last comprises his three reports in 1869-70 to the Minister of War in defence of his military and diplomatic conduct during the war of 1866. His correspondence with the great men of Italy and of Europe for thirty years has been preserved in part, as well as the letters addressed to him by the late King, Cavour, Massimo d'Azeglio, Rattazzi, etc., etc.—'Keramos, and Other Poems,' is the title of Mr. Longfellow's new volume just issued by Houghton, Osgood & Co. The same firm have nearly ready Gen. F. W. Palfrey's 'Memoirs of William Francis Bartlett,' of which the author's profits will go to General Bartlett's family.—The New England Publishing Co., Boston, announce 'Outlines for the Study of English Classics,' by A. F. Blaisdell.—J. Norman Lockyer's 'Studies in Spectrum Analysis,' with numerous illustrations, forming vol. xxiii. of 'The International Scientific Series,' will be published in a few days by D. Appleton & Co., New York.—In our financial paragraph last week the offer of the banks to Secretary Sherman was accidentally misstated. It was 100 gold (not 101½) and accrued interest.

—Racinet's 'Costume Historique' is now one-quarter finished, and its union of reasonable cheapness and thoroughness—a thoroughness to be predicted before opening the cover, for the name Firmin-Didot is printed on it—adapts his work to the need of poor artists as well as rich book-collectors. The fourth instalment (just received by J. W. Bouton) contains twenty-five plates, printed in gold and colors with much neatness and accuracy. The emblazonment is never exaggerated nor merely ornamental, but simply explains the tissues. The author has sought out and set in order many documents, conferring on the reader the hidden riches of precious vellums and tapestries and frescos. Particularly interesting is the copy of a complete view of a Roman bathing establishment, from a mural painting found in the Baths of Titus; and there is a mystically-fascinating page giving fifty-six impressions of Roman abraxas or amulets.

—The last number of the *American Law Review* contains an article on the "Nicholas plan" for Presidential elections, which deserves attention as a carefully thought-out scheme of improvement. Most of the plans suggested by the electoral troubles of 1876 have been marked by a great deal of crudity, and have often evinced a total lack of appreciation of the

most fundamental axioms of political science ; they have all proceeded on the supposition that the Tilden-Hayes dispute of that year had its origin in some defects of the electoral machinery, instead, as the fact was, of having been caused by the anarchical condition of a large part of the country, which by its long continuance had rendered fraud, "intimidation," and violent interference with the result of elections part of the ordinary course of political action. No change in machinery could have prevented the condition of affairs then existing in South Carolina and Louisiana, and it was on the chaotic condition of affairs in those States that the election turned. Seeing this to be the case, Judge Nicholas proposes that, instead of making new and cumbrous rules as to "double returns" and "single returns," the attempt shall be made to convert the electoral college into a real electing body, which shall not clerically register the choice of a national party convention, but shall actually elect a President from the leading men of the country. For this purpose he proposes that each State shall choose a certain number of electors, based on population; that these electors shall be divided into a number of classes in alphabetical order; that from these classes a smaller number shall be elected; that from this smaller number two shall be drawn by lot, the whole college then proceeding to elect one of these President, whereupon the other becomes Vice-President. The great beauty of this plan is, of course, that it prevents combinations and "slates" in advance, and therefore makes national party nominations in convention useless. As the lot is inevitably to be brought in at a certain stage in the contest, it would be idle to form a combination which would have no certainty of coming to anything. On the other hand, the lot would set a premium on excellence in the electoral body, since each State, feeling only sure of a remote chance of electing even one of its men, would make a point of securing a board of electors any one of whom it would be satisfied to see in the Presidential chair. Of course the chief objection to the scheme (apart from the unwillingness to introduce chance into elective machinery, which, from the mere fact that it never has been introduced though often talked about, must be considered serious), is, as the *Review* points out, its impracticability. We fear the plan will have few attractions for those who must in the first instance put the machinery in motion to bring it before the people—the Conklings, Blaines, Thurmans, and Hendrickses. Some of them might be willing to have it introduced in 1884—but not a day sooner.

—In the absence of anything new from George Eliot's hand, the two short tales included in the cheap edition of her works in course of publication by Messrs. Blackwood and now for the first time reprinted, may be accepted as a novelty. They appear at the end of the volume which contains "Silas Marner," and will doubtless procure for this volume an extended circulation. One of them, "The Lifted Veil," was published in *Blackwood's Magazine* in 1859; the other, "Brother Jacob," appeared in the *Cornhill* one year later. They are extremely different, but each is interesting, and the reader who turns to them now will doubtless wonder why the author has not oftener attempted to express herself within the limits of that form of fiction which the French call the *nouvelle*. George Eliot will probably always remain the great novelist who has written fewest short stories. As her genius has unfolded she has departed more and more from the "short story" standard, and become, if not absolutely the longest-winded, at least what may be called the most spacious, of romancers. Of the two tales in question, "Brother Jacob," which is wholly of a humorous cast, is much the better. We say it is of a humorous cast, but it is probable that like everything of George Eliot's it may be credited with something of a philosophic import—offered as it is as an example of the many forms, in the author's own words, "in which the great Nemesis hides herself." The great Nemesis here is the idiot brother of a small criminal, who brings the latter to shame and confusion by an obstinate remembrance of the sweet things he has swallowed. The guilty brother, of whose guilt he has been an accidental witness, has bribed him to secrecy by a present of sugar-plums, and when Mr. David Faux is after the lapse of years flourishing, under an assumed name, upon the indirect fruits of his misdemeanors (a petty robbery) the too appreciative Jacob reappears clamoring for more lozenges, and throwing a fatal light upon Mr. Faux's past. The story is extremely clever, but it is a little injured, perhaps, by an air of effort, by too visible an attempt to say good things, to bestrew the reader's path with epigrams. As the incident is related wholly in the ironic, satiric manner, the temptation to be pregnant witty was, of course, particularly strong. But the figure of the diminutively mean and sneaking young man upon whom the great Nemesis descends is a real portrait; it is an admirable picture of unromantic malfeasance. Capital, too, is the fatal Jacob, who, after the manner of idiots, leaves us with a sense of his combined vagueness and obstructiveness. The minor touches

are very brilliant, and the story is, generally, excellent reading. "The Lifted Veil," which is more metaphysical, is, we think, less successful. It relates the history of a young man who, growing up in morbid physical conditions, acquires a mysterious intellectual foresight of the things that are to happen to him; together with that of a wicked lady, his wife, whose guilt is brought to light by the experiment of infusing blood into the heart of a person just dead, who revives for an instant and denounces her. The tale is woefully sombre, and there is a want of connection between the clairvoyance of the hero and the incidents we have just related. Each of these things is very wonderful, but in conjunction they are rather violent. "The Lifted Veil," however, is a fine piece of writing; and if they were interesting for nothing else, these two tales would be interesting as the *jeu d'esprit* of a mind that is not often—perhaps not often enough—found at play.

—It is said that Albert Wagner, the oldest brother of the poet-composer, did not believe in Richard's musical powers, but admitted that he could write poetry; and H. Dorn, the well-known Berlin critic, who does not especially admire Wagner's music, some years ago asserted that some of his poetic efforts must be ranked with the best that German literature affords. The poem of the new music-drama, "Parsifal," recently published (Mainz: Schott's Söhne), is not likely to weaken this latter opinion. It abounds in beautiful passages, and there is one, on page 20, where the hero is reproached for shooting a sacred swan, which is fully equal to the celebrated passage in "Lohengrin" beginning with "Athmest du nicht mit mir die süßen Däfte" (vol. ii, p. 135). In general, however, the kind of beauty to be sought for in Wagner's poems differs somewhat from that which we look for in poetry not produced with a view to its being wedded to music. Poetic imagery, similes, and metaphors, which are essential features of a purely literary drama, would be superfluous in a music-drama, where the sister art is expected to supply all the emotional color; and accordingly we find that the attractiveness of Wagner's *libretti* does not consist in elegant diction, but in the ingenious and artistic dramatic structure of the whole, and in the gradual leading up to a climax, in which he has no superior. "Parsifal" is another proof of his skill in building up a good dramatic plot with material which, as used by Wolfram von Eschenbach and other old German and French poets, seems more of an epic than a dramatic nature. Many of the situations in it are, moreover, so intensely musical in structure that an appreciative reader cannot fail to imagine that he is actually hearing the music, just as he does in reading some of the most emotional scenes in Goethe's "Faust"—a circumstance which strongly corroborates the theory of the music-drama. If in these esoteric characteristics "Parsifal" does not differ from the author's other recent dramas, in some of its external features it bears more resemblance to his earlier works. Alliterative verse is abandoned, rhyme is here and there introduced, antiquated words and phrases are not so numerous as elsewhere, and, most important of all, there is no lack of polyphonic vocal music, there being several choruses of knights, youths, and maidens, apart and united. These cases of "reversion," however, must not be regarded as concessions to the critics. They are evidently due to the fact that, as "Parsifal" is the father of "Lohengrin," the first-named drama will, in a certain sense, serve as an introduction to its predecessor. How far this circumstance is likely to influence the form and character of the music, on which the composer is now engaged, it is difficult to predict. One never knows what Wagner is going to do next, any more than one can say what chord he is going to use next at any given point in one of his compositions. The stage-machinists and scene-painters must have been anxiously wondering what new problem would be given them to solve this time; and "Parsifal" certainly gives them some hard nuts to crack. The demands made on their inventive skill and on the purse of the manager are such as perhaps no one but Wagner would dare to make. The first performance of the new music-drama, which will doubtless prove one of his most popular works, is promised for the summer of 1880 at Bayreuth. There is evidence that the drama was written, or at least revised, with a view to its performance in the Nibelung Theatre. It will be remembered that one of the innovations introduced in that theatre related to the curtain, which did not rise, as elsewhere, but was parted in the middle, "as by invisible hands." Accordingly, at the end of each of the three acts of "Parsifal," the directions are "The curtain *closes*," instead of "falls," and the German feuilletonists are now sarcastically speculating whether it will be necessary in consequence to give up the word *Aufzug*, and coin another to take its place.

—In No. 154 of the *Nation*, for June 11, 1868, mention was made of

the great interest in the American Revolution felt in Russia, as shown by the despatches of that period in the Russian archives. A new instance of this interest, not only in Russia but in Europe in general, is given in the fac-simile number of the *Sankt Peterburgskaya Vedomosti* for January 7, 1778, just published by that newspaper on completing the one hundred and fiftieth year of its existence. The *St. Petersburg Gazette* or the *Gazette of the Academy*, as its name is frequently translated, is one of the oldest newspapers in Europe, if not the oldest, having been started by the Imperial Academy of Sciences in 1728, to replace the *Gazette* originally published by Peter the Great in 1703, the year of the foundation of St. Petersburg. This newspaper is still owned by the Academy, just as the *Moscow Gazette* is owned by the Moscow University, but it is farmed out at a tolerably high rent to private parties, for whose opinions and utterances the Academy is not responsible. The fac-simile of the first number of the *Gazette*, January 7, 1728, contains nothing of interest to us, and is merely curious, but the one first referred to, of 1778, is almost entirely filled with American news, coming from correspondents as far apart as London, Dublin, Paris, Nantes, Franconia, and The Hague. Letters from Germany say that still another corps of troops from Ansbach-Baireuth is to be sent to America, not as before by the Main and the Rhine, but directly *via* Bremer-Lehe. They state also that

"The nobles, burghers, and peasantry of Hesse, seeing that the Landgrave pays no attention to their representations about the losses they have suffered in consequence of troops being sent to America, resolved, as a final resort, to petition the Emperor and the Diet that his Majesty, as the head and defender of the laws and freedom of the States of the Empire, should take the best measure for stopping the exportation of such a great multitude of people to a distant part of the world. It is said that the Emperor and the King of Prussia, in consequence of this petition, have agreed to prevent in future the export of troops to America."

The greatest interest centred, however, in the news of the surrender of Burgoyne, which had, indeed, arrived before, but was then confirmed from every quarter, and evidently made a profound impression throughout Europe—an impression which was increased by the news of the loss of eleven British ships in an attack on the obstructions in the river Delaware, below Philadelphia, and rumors that "the rebel General Putnam" together with General Gates were pursuing the British troops on the Hudson, and threatening them with a fate like Burgoyne's. The results of all this were reports that the English were to "send special plenipotentiaries to treat with the Congress of the Colonies. In the event of these negotiations being unsuccessful, politicians in England were of opinion that General Howe would be forced to evacuate Philadelphia, and that strictly defensive positions would be taken up in Quebec, Halifax, New York, and Florida (*sic*), with 24,000 troops." In a letter from Dublin, it was stated that

"On the 1st December Mr. Edward Nevenham said in the Lower House of Parliament: Although all that I reported to the Government in 1775 has been denied, I now consider it my duty to declare to the members that I have received trustworthy information that the American Envoys in Paris received on the fourth or fifth of November full powers from the Congress to conclude a treaty with France, by which that country, on furnishing a certain number of ships and troops, shall have the right for thirty years of exclusive trade with America."

What this trade was worth we may see from a letter in the same number from Nantes of November 25 and December 6:

"Although the English capture many American ships, which has made the rates of insurance rise to forty-three and forty-four per cent., yet we still send many vessels to America. Besides munitions of war and cloth for uniforms, we send them a great deal of salt, for every pound of which we receive a pound of tobacco, which we sell to the farmers of the revenue at forty kopeks. You can judge from this how profitable this trade is for us."

From this single number one is led to ask whether the history of the American Revolution has been sufficiently studied for European contemporary sources.

THE CRUISE OF THE CHALLENGER.*

ALTHOUGH water covers three-quarters of the earth's surface, and its oceans have been traversed from time immemorial in all directions and at all seasons of the year, our knowledge of the physical geography of the sea has been of slow growth. The early navigators, with few exceptions, left but scanty records of such observations as they made. The accounts of their discoveries bequeathed to us by the Norsemen, who evidently knew the northern hemisphere better than their more civilized

southern neighbors, are often little more than sagas, wild traditions of the deeds of their ancestors. The Spanish and Portuguese explorers in their search after conquest and power did, indeed, by their rude charts lay the foundation of the later and more accurate maps of the Atlantic, Pacific, and Indian Oceans. But the association of systematic scientific research with distant voyages or with coast surveys belongs to our own times. The last part of the past century was, however, marked by great government exploring expeditions, while during the early decades of this century nearly every country possessing a merchant navy fitted out important circumnavigating voyages. From the few desultory observations made independently by the leaders of these explorations we have accumulated little by little the facts now in our possession concerning the physical geography of the sea.

In the meanwhile not only had the broad outlines of terrestrial physical geography been traced, but our knowledge of terrestrial physics comprised the study of the atmosphere at different heights, theories of winds, the distribution of magnetism, the oscillations of the barometer, the distribution of moisture, the thermometric conditions above and below the surface of the earth, and the range of animal and vegetable life. In fact, all the principal physical phenomena surrounding us and connected with the surface of the earth had been more or less investigated. Our knowledge of the ocean, on the contrary, included little beyond the position and direction of the more prominent oceanic currents. We knew nothing of the depths of the sea or of its temperature, except what could be readily observed along its shores or what a few more adventurous sailors had discovered on fishing and whaling voyages. We remained ignorant even of the causes determining those great currents with which navigators had so long been practically familiar. It is true that little can be done towards the investigation of the physical and biological conditions of the sea by individual enterprise alone. Before 1860 both private and associated means had from time to time been placed at the disposal of naturalists for such researches, but the results obtained seemed to promise no very novel or fruitful field for work. It was only in connection with great national undertakings, and after the first soundings were taken between Ireland and Newfoundland to determine the best path for an Atlantic cable, that the hidden possibilities of deep-sea investigations dawned upon naturalists and physicists.

The difficulties were great. Without experience to guide us, without the mechanical tools needed for the work, we were forced to begin at the A. B. C. Instruments combining strength with the most sensitive tests had to be devised for determining depths, for measuring temperatures accurately, for collecting the deep-sea fauna and flora. The share taken by Americans in the invention as well as in the modifying and perfecting of instruments for this new work, especially those used in determining and recording depths and temperatures, is very creditable to the United States. We owe, for instance, to the ingenuity of Passed-Midshipman Brooke, U.S.N., the means by which we now detect, even at great depths, the instant when the heavily-weighted sounding-rope touches bottom, releasing its load at the same moment. This method was gradually improved and modified, till Sir William Thomson proposed his apparatus for sounding with piano-forte wire, an instrument of such delicacy that after the first experiments he himself despaired of its practical efficiency. Here again the U. S. Navy stepped in, and Captain Belknap, of the *Tuscarora*, succeeded in working it with a certainty of result hardly anticipated even by the inventor.* Indeed, with the modifications this instrument has received at the hands of the U. S. naval officers, its rapidity of action and its accuracy are such that with a slender wire and a fifty-pound shot a sounding can be taken and a specimen of the bottom can be brought up from a depth of 2,000 fathoms, or more than two statute miles, in about twenty-five minutes.

Norwegian and Swedish naturalists living among the fjords and inlets of their picturesque coast became interested in these problems of the deep sea. To them, and especially to Professors Lovén of Stockholm, and Sars of Christiania, we owe the more recent generalizations regarding animal life at great depths, and the probable conditions of existence there. Their lead has been followed, and since 1860 not only Swedes and Norwegians but English and Americans have vied with each other in sending out expeditions to explore the depth of the sea either across the oceans or along their own coasts. Among the latter, the investigations undertaken by the U. S. Coast Survey, begun under the superintendence of the late Professor Bache, and continued by his successors, Prof. Peirce and Captain Patterson, combining the examination of our coasts with

* The Cruise of the *Challenger*. "The Atlantic." By Sir Wyville Thomson. Published by permission of the Lords Commissioners of the Admiralty. Vols. I., II. London: Macmillan & Co.; New York: Harper & Bros. 1878.

* It seems strange that the *Challenger* did not adopt this admirable apparatus after its success in the hands of officers of the U. S. Navy.

the physical geography of the Gulf Stream, are of prominent importance. It is perhaps the most complete and systematic exploration as yet made of any coast with reference to its hydrography and physical geography. Of the distant exploring voyages sent out during the last twenty years none can compare, however, in valuable results with the great *Challenger* expedition which returned about two years ago from a cruise of three years and a half, the history of which is partly given in the two volumes before us. The *Challenger* was a large steam corvette of twenty-three hundred tons, equipped with everything which the wise forethought of a committee of the Royal Society, aided by Sir Wyville Thomson, Chief of the Civilian Staff, could suggest. The success of the voyage has demonstrated the wisdom of the Royal Society and of the Admiralty in placing Captain Nares in command of the *Challenger*. The expedition itself will long be remembered as a landmark in the history of deep-sea explorations. During the cruise of the *Challenger* no less than three hundred and sixty stations were established. At most of these both the exact depth and the character of the bottom were determined, a fair sample of the fauna was brought up by the trawl or dredge, the temperature of the bottom and of intermediate depths was ascertained, and samples of the water were procured, while the tow-nets in the meantime gathered the surface life in the vicinity. The Atlantic and the Pacific were explored both north and south of the Equator, and the *Challenger* even forced her way far into the Antarctic regions till, fairly driven back by tempests and ice, she made her way to Australia and explored the more genial regions of the East India Islands.

The typography and illustrations of "The Atlantic" are admirable. The volumes are filled with exquisite woodcuts, illustrating the wonderful forms brought up by the dredge and trawl from all depths (in the Atlantic from 3,875 fathoms, or over four statute miles), and varying from the diminutive globigerina to the magnificent siliceous sponges, corals, star-fishes, sea-urchins, crustaceans, and fishes, which seem to be the most numerous and striking inhabitants of the deeper ocean. Here and there in these volumes the naturalist is forgotten, and we have a vivid description of scenery illustrated by charming sketches. Passing on to the discussion of the serial lines of temperatures, the author shows how the Atlantic and Pacific Gulfs, as he calls them (looking, indeed, upon these oceans as mere branches of the great southern seas), are fed by the slow welling northward of the intensely cold and immensely deep Antarctic waters. With these phenomena he believes the whole system of ocean circulation to be connected, assigning as their primary cause the excess of precipitation upon the southern or water hemisphere over the evaporation in the northern or land hemisphere. This gives us a ready explanation of the nearly uniform temperature pervading the sea bottom below a certain depth in all oceans. The presence of this huge mass of cold water and its influence upon marine life establish the theory first proposed by Dana, that the amount of cold is the true factor regulating the distribution of animals in the sea. It explains also the cropping out of antarctic forms, without reference to latitude, wherever the temperature of the water is low, and their reappearance in deep waters over areas where the temperature of the shallower water along the adjacent shores may be very warm.

Another most interesting line of investigation, previously pointed out by others but systematically pursued by the *Challenger*, concerns the formation of deep-sea deposits out of reach of all detritus brought down by rivers. Especially striking is the formation of red clay in depths below 2,200 fathoms from the gradual decomposition of surface organic forms, while in lesser depths a kind of chalk is formed, consisting chiefly of the tests of globigerinae. The importance of the latter in building up oceanic deposits was first discovered early in 1853 by Lieutenants Craven and Moffat, of the United States Navy, while investigating some question relating to the Gulf Stream.

These results, taken as a whole, lead to one great generalization. The facts gathered from deep-sea soundings make it probable that continents as we know them now were laid out in their present grand outlines at the time of the Jurassic period, and have remained, with the exception of such shore deposits as we call Cretaceous and Tertiary, practically unchanged ever since. If this be true, there have been since the Cretaceous or the end of the Jurassic period abysses of the sea far below the reach of any effect from the subsidence or elevation of the land—uninfluenced, therefore, by surface cataclysms or changes—where, owing to the continued uniformity of the conditions, the inhabitants must be the lineal descendants of beings belonging to former geological periods. In these abyssal depths brilliant huge-eyed crustacea exist side by side with blind forms like Willemoesia and other crustacea having more or less developed visual organs. Here also are found blind fishes and fishes having very small eyes, together

with fishes endowed with sight as those of the ordinary types are. The questions thus opened as to the effect of physical conditions acting upon animal life during periods of time for which the present epoch gives us no measure are certainly of the greatest importance from a biological point of view. This more uniform fauna of the abyssal depths, which probably originated in the southern seas and is independent of geographical distribution, does not extend into the 500-fathom region, where we come upon what naturalists call faunal districts or areas both geographically and zoologically distinct from each other.

While the *Challenger* found animals living in the greatest depths, we must not be understood to say that they exist everywhere in equally large numbers. On the contrary, the greatest depths, though not fatal to life, are less favorable to its maintenance than more moderate depths, especially where not too far from land. Marine plants are far more limited in their bathymetrical distribution than animals. They are not found below two hundred fathoms, so that we have an immense marine fauna entirely disassociated from plant life and independent of those mutual relations by which the balance of animal and vegetable life is maintained on land. These deep-sea forms must derive either by power of absorption from the water itself or from their animal food the materials necessary for their growth and life.

Much as we owe to the *Challenger* it leaves many of the great problems of the physics and chemistry of the deep sea yet unsolved. His concluding chapters show that Sir Wyville Thomson himself considers his physical and chemical speculations only as approximations awaiting the confirmation of time and further investigation.

LECKY'S HISTORY OF ENGLAND IN THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY.*

II.

"THE Methodist movement," writes Mr. Lecky, "was a purely religious one. All explanations which ascribe it to the ambition of its leaders, or to merely intellectual causes, are at variance with the facts of the case." These sentences show that Mr. Lecky appreciates the true character of Methodism, and raise the expectation that he will prove a satisfactory critic of a most remarkable religious movement. Nor is this expectation altogether disappointed. No part of Mr. Lecky's work will cause more interest than his chapters on Methodism. They are distinguished by the good sense, the right feeling, and, above all, by the pre-eminent fairness which are the great merits of his book. No author has ever summed up with more equity the good and the bad results of Wesleyanism. He shows what were the circumstances under which the religious revival took place; he points to its wide and salutary influence; he describes the virtues without concealing the defects of Wesley and Whitefield, and does even more than justice to the administrative genius of the one and the oratorical genius of the other. But when ample acknowledgment has been made of Mr. Lecky's merits both as a critic and as an historian of Methodism, it is impossible not also to acknowledge that Mr. Lecky's treatment of a religious phenomenon leaves on the mind a sense of failure. The cause of this feeling lies, not in any fault peculiar to Mr. Lecky, but in defects inherent in the prevailing mode of treating religious questions. The attempt to explain the cause of our dissatisfaction is not intended to detract from the merits of an author entitled in many respects to the highest praise, but is intended to direct attention to characteristic defects of the current criticism and sentiment of the time.

The fundamental ground of dissatisfaction with Mr. Lecky's narrative is that he deals with every feature of Methodism except its most essential feature, namely, the truth of the doctrine which Wesley taught and the truth of the view of life which it was his object to impress upon his disciples. Mr. Lecky, indeed, has too much critical acumen not to perceive that to Wesley his religious convictions were everything, and he describes, in a passage too long to quote, and not perhaps very suitable for quotation in a newspaper, the graphic picture given by the founder of Methodism of his conversion. But Mr. Lecky does not seem to feel, what both Wesley and Wesley's serious opponents would at once have acknowledged, that on the truth or error of Wesley's views as to conversion and a whole number of kindred topics must depend any fair estimate of his career. On no subject except religious subjects do competent critics judge a leader of thought without reference to the intrinsic truth or error of the doctrine which he promulgated. It would be ridiculous to criticize Bacon with-

* A History of England in the Eighteenth Century. By William Edward Hartpole Lecky. 2 vols. London: Longmans, Green & Co.; New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1878.

out considering the truth of his general views of science. It would be absurd to write an essay on Burke and leave out of consideration the value of his political views. It would be futile to narrate the career of De Tocqueville and leave it an open question whether his estimate of democracy embodied important truths or only propagated ingenious fallacies. It is, and in any age but this would have been deemed, equally futile to treat of the growth of Methodism without uttering any opinion on the view of life of which Methodism is or was the representative; for no phrases can hide the fact that men like Wesley and Whitefield looked at human existence from a point of view utterly different from that occupied by most of the men whom we all in our ordinary state of sentiment respect and admire.

Long before the 24th of May, 1738, Wesley had led a life of what to most persons would seem the practice of every virtue, yet till that day he was, in his own belief, to quote Mr. Lecky's words, "in a state of damnation." Grant that in judging himself Wesley was biased by the excessive exactingness of a morbid conscience. To grant this is to concede a good deal more than the facts warrant; but even this concession does not get rid of the difference, not in degree but in kind, between Wesley's idea of the requirements of religion and the conceptions of a virtuous life formed not only by the ordinary teachers of the eighteenth century but also by ninety-nine out of every hundred Englishmen or Americans of the present day. Let it be carefully noted that the difference between an unconverted and a converted man (to use religious phraseology) must be considered in kind something quite different from the difference recognized by all men between wicked and virtuous persons. The end of the eighteenth-century preachers was, as Mr. Lecky points out, to create "good and happy men." Many of these preachers lived, we need not doubt, up to their ideal. The quarrel between them and Wesley was that their ideal was in his judgment a wrong ideal. The somewhat heathen virtues of Chatham, the manly integrity of such a man, for example, as Sir Walter Scott, would, as far as one can judge, have seemed in the eyes of Wesley or of Whitefield not more akin to what may be termed the true life of the soul than the brutality of Walpole or the coarseness of Swift. We do not, of course, mean for a moment to assert that any men of keen moral sensibility, such as were the founders of Methodism, would not, in fact, have felt the difference between virtues which in theory they might have held hardly to merit that name, and vices which good men of all ages have reprobated, but we do assert that, on Mr. Lecky's own showing, the Methodists propounded doctrines which made the difference between the virtues of Chatham and the vices say of George II. far less serious than the difference between what may be termed the virtues of secular life and the condition of converted sinners.

Now, there are two modes in which the doctrines of Wesleyanism and of other religious teachers may be fairly approached by an historian. He may, if such is his belief, take his stand on the truth of the religious teaching. A man who entirely or in the main shares Wesley's views may rightly represent Methodism as the reformation of the eighteenth century. A writer who honestly takes this view may justly give to Wesley all the admiration which is due to the greatest of reformers. He will feel that the incidental benefits of Methodism in ameliorating the condition of the poor or softening the manners of the rich are absolutely nothing in comparison with its revelation of truth and with its success in saving souls. He must, however, in fairness bear in mind that the voice of Wesley and of Whitefield denounces the spirit of the nineteenth no less than the spirit of the eighteenth century. An historian may, on the other hand, announce (if such be his conviction) that the doctrines of Methodism were wholly or partially erroneous. Entertaining such a view, he will not be blinded by the virtues of Wesley and his disciples to the fact that a view of life in the main erroneous must be a source of evil to those who preach and to those who receive it. What it seems to us a serious writer ought not to do is to fall in with the current feeling of the present generation, who admire Wesley without forming a distinct opinion as to the truth or error of his doctrine, and calmly condemn the worldliness of the eighteenth century, when in fact moulding their lives on essentially the same views as those which Wesley's opponents upheld and Wesley denounced. A critic who assumes such an attitude falls under a twofold disability which fundamentally vitiates the effect of his historical judgment.

He is unable, in the first place, fairly to estimate the position of Wesley's opponents. Society has improved in various particulars since the day when Wesley denounced the religious apathy of his contemporaries; but it is far from the case that every change since his time has been an

improvement. We have thrown off some of the vices and we have lost some of the virtues of our fathers, but in the main the ordinary educated world of to-day is not at bottom very different from respectable society in the last generation. If Wesley saw in the respectability of his own age a condition of religious death, are we to suppose that he would think the social life of London or New York to be an existence fit for Christians? In some respects the tone of our age would in his judgment be decidedly worse than that of his own century. If any candid person will consider what Wesley or Whitefield would think of the religious or irreligious articles which fill respectable English magazines, he may form an opinion whether the apostles of Methodism would look with anything but reprobation on the sentiment prevalent in this century. Nor would they find any fervor of religious feeling to compensate for dogmatic error. A fashion has sprung up of talking of the religious coldness of the eighteenth century. Such language was perhaps true when used in comparing the state of public feeling before the Wesleyan movement with the condition of religious sentiment which that movement produced in certain classes; but the fervor generated by the efforts of the Methodists and the Evangelicals who followed them has now in the main died out. To talk of this age as, in England at least, an era of religious enthusiasm, is simply to misapply language. The men of the eighteenth and the men of the nineteenth century are, so to speak, in one boat. If Wesley's denunciations touched his contemporaries, they condemn us also. If the men of to-day can show that they rightly decline to adhere to Wesley's view of life, the same defence will in substance avail the preachers whose rational piety or cold morality opposed the religious enthusiasm of the early Wesleyans. To imply that what called forth the efforts of Whitefield was any exceptional wickedness or corruption among his contemporaries involves a misapprehension both of the character of our forefathers and of the true nature of Wesleyans.

A critic who takes up the attitude of benevolent neutrality can, in the second place, no more pass a fair judgment on the results of Methodism than he can form a just opinion of its opponents. A mere enumeration of the reforms which a religious movement has produced, or of the beneficial measures, such as Catholic emancipation, which it has delayed, hardly touches either its essential merits or its essential evils. To announce the truth, either as regards religion or as regards any other matter in which mankind are interested, is an achievement so admirable in itself that one need not, in judging of its worth, be greatly concerned about its immediate or apparent results. But, on the other hand, a view of religion and of the objects of human life which is untrue is certain to produce fundamental and essential evils out of all proportion to its immediate and palpable results. That the teaching of Wesley must have produced a huge amount of spiritual suffering is clearly apparent; that if his doctrines were in the main not true, this fearful suffering was a needless addition to human misery must also be conceded; but to any one who is not prepared to accept the Wesleyan view of life it must be apparent that Methodism produced an evil which, if more subtle, is of more permanent importance than even the pain caused to sensitive souls racked by the terrors roused by Wesleyan sermons. This evil is the setting up in men's minds of inconsistent ideals. The disciples who fully embraced Methodism gained, at least, all that can be gained by the consistency given to life through enthusiastic belief in a definite creed. The persons, on the other hand, who entirely resisted the influence of the Wesleyan movement may have followed out with consistency their own ideal of life; but in effect great portions of English society half accepted doctrines to which Wesley and his disciples had given life, and half adhered, in practice at least, to what may be termed the secular view of existence. Their whole life became weakened by a half-and-half devotion to each of two fundamentally inconsistent ideals. That this double-mindedness has been and still is the bane of English society seems to us past a doubt. Other causes certainly have contributed to the same result, but the religious revival, of which Wesleyanism was a part, has been in the main responsible for a condition of sentiment opposed at once to the secular enthusiasm which governed the life of such a man as Turgot, and to the religious enthusiasm which ruled the life of Whitefield. If the Wesleyan teachers held to a true view of human nature and human duty, then they are in no way responsible for the fact that their teaching has not commanded the entire acceptance of a perverse generation. If, on the other hand, they upheld an erroneous view of the objects of human life, then, whatever the virtues of the Wesleyan preachers, they have entailed on succeeding generations all the evils resulting from the half-hearted devotion which is all that false ideals can in the long run obtain. A critic who cannot assert whether the teaching of these preachers was

true or false cannot really pronounce on the results of their teaching. You cannot criticise a "purely religious movement" and omit all reference to the truth or falsehood or error of the doctrines held by the teachers who guided the movement.

Current Discussion: A Collection from the Chief English Essays on Questions of the Time. Edited by Edward L. Burlingame. Vol. I. International Politics. (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1878.)—The plan of this publication is a thoroughly good one, and we have no doubt will meet with success. As appears from the preface, in which Mr. Burlingame gives some editorial account of the undertaking, the intention of the publishers is to reproduce in a permanent form the best of the contemporary magazine articles—those bearing on important political events, or such as otherwise may be of some permanent importance as contributions of weight to current discussion. The present volume is devoted to politics, and in it we have a number of articles by well-known writers on the Eastern question. This is to be followed by another installment of a religious character, embracing a number of essays on matters of belief. Mr. Burlingame, in his preface, points out, what is perhaps true, that the magazines which have succeeded to the place of the old quarterlies occupy a position as important now as the *Edinburgh* once did; that the *Nineteenth Century*, the *Contemporary*, and the *Fortnightly* number among their contributors the best and weightiest writers of the day. At no time, he thinks, has there been so much and so weighty magazine-writing in England as at present. There is one change, however, which makes a very marked difference between the articles of the present day and their forerunners in the pages of the quarterlies; and that is the fact that the modern practice of publishing the author's name confuses our appreciation of the merits of his performance with our curiosity as to his identity. An article by Gladstone, for instance, has an adventitious importance which gives it an audience at once, no matter whether he writes on some political subject on which he is an authority, or on the 'Iliad,' as to which his critical opinions are of no very great value. In the days of the early successes of the *Edinburgh* the anonymous veil which cloaked the author left his production to stand on its own merits; and we think did so in the interest of good taste and letters. There is a certain indecency in the constant exposure of themselves which well-known public characters are constantly induced, by the solicitation of publishers, to make in the periodical press, and we cannot help thinking that there is a certain analogy between the modern English magazine system and our own lecture system; in other words, that its object in great part is not so much to inform the reader's mind as it is to provide for him a cheap view of living celebrities. This fact cannot but affect the quality of the productions; for the writer who knows that his name will draw a crowd necessarily takes far less pains with his work than one who feels that what he writes must tell by its own weight. We cannot quite agree with Mr. Burlingame in thinking that the present is the halcyon time of English periodical writing. We do not find in the first volume of 'Current Discussion' anything which need make the shades of Macaulay and his colleagues envious, and we cannot help believing that the articles both of Mr. Forbes (the author of 'Russians, Turks, and Bulgarians') and Mr. Freeman (the author of 'The Relation of the English People to the Russo-Turkish War') would have greater permanent value if they had no names appended to them. All this, however, does not detract from the value of the series as a record of current discussion; Mr. Burlingame's selections seem to have been made with good sense, and amply justify his choice as editor.

The Origin of Nations. In two parts: On Early Civilizations; On Ethnic Affinities, etc. By George Rawlinson, M.A. (New York: Scribner, Welford & Co. 12mo, pp. 272.)—This volume, like Professor Rawlinson's 'Historical Illustrations of the Old Testament,' is professedly apologetic. Its avowed purpose is to defend the inspiration of the Scriptures against attacks made on the credibility of the chronology of Genesis, or on the absolute correctness of its ethnology. Canon Rawlinson

thinks it "disparaging to the Divine Word" to suppose that there can be an error of any sort, even historical, in the Bible, and it has been to him an "unpleasant duty" to read books which take any historical position inconsistent with "its plain and literal sense." He appears to conceive it to be a pious duty to defend the exact and literal truth of every historical statement of Scripture with which he is concerned. His concern in this volume is to show that no civilization goes back to a period of more than twenty-five hundred years before Christ, and that the ethnology of the tenth chapter of Genesis is correct in every particular.

The fault of the book lies where it might be expected—in the special pleading to which such an avowed object is a temptation. Perhaps the most important chapter is that devoted to a discussion of the age of the Egyptian monarchy, but the discussion is inadequate enough. It consists simply in a balancing of authorities, without reference to their date. Mariette and Lenormant are quoted as putting the beginning of the Egyptian history under Menes at 5000 B.C., while against them are quoted Lepsius (1849), Reginald S. Poole (1860), and Sir Gardiner Wilkinson (1862), as believing that these were contemporaneous dynasties given by Berosus as consecutive. This may be so; but the Canon fails to state that Lepsius, Poole, and Wilkinson had to depend on Manetho, and that Mariette had the advantage of several monuments discovered since Wilkinson's writing which completely confirm Manetho, and represent the dynasties not as contemporaneous, but entirely consecutive. It would have been only fair to mention this fact, of which Canon Rawlinson was aware, having Lenormant's 'Manual' under his eye, and quoting from it all he seems to know of Mariette. What Lepsius believed in 1849 or Bunsen in 1857 or Poole in 1860 is of little account since the discovery of Thothmes's "Hall of Ancestors" and of the two "Tablets of Abydos." It was Canon Rawlinson's business, if he will depend upon authorities, to tell us what Birch and Lepsius and Brugsch believe now on the subject. From Egypt our author turns to a dozen other nations, showing—and his task is easy—that there is in no single case any trustworthy evidence of an antiquity which would overlap Ussher's date for the Flood. Our author's discussion of the ethnology of Genesis is again far from satisfactory. As a consideration showing that Tiras may be identified with Thrace (which is probable enough), notwithstanding the difference in the third consonant, he mentions that "the *k* of *ῥῥῥῥ*, *ῥῥῥῥ* passes into *ss* in the feminine form, *ῥῥῥῥα* or *ῥῥῥῥα*," a fact which has no bearing, as the change is purely euphonic. The Philistines are represented as Hamitic in their language, which is contrary to all evidence and authority. Professor Rawlinson gives a list of four certain and six possibly Philistine proper names, all of which, he says, seem to have Egyptian affinities. But he omits, strangely enough, all five of the names of their chief cities, three of which his favorite authority, R. S. Poole, recognizes as Hebrew, the name of their god Dagon, of pure Hebrew root, and all the Philistine names which reach us through the Assyrian monuments, such as Mitinti, Rukupti, Hanun, Zidqa, and Zilli-bel, and which are pure Hebrew. Such a treatment of this familiar subject is very reprehensible. Even worse is his attempt to make it out that the Canaanites spoke a Hamitic and not a Semitic language. The contrary is notoriously the fact. On the matter of the language of Nimrod and his cities our author implicitly follows his brother, Sir Henry's, opinions of 1858, that the vocabulary of the Accadian is Cushite. But we doubt if even he would now hold to that opinion. Indeed, it is universally agreed among competent scholars that the early Babylonians spoke a Turanian language. To identify the Egyptian sun god Ra with the supreme god of the Babylonians is the height of absurdity, since we now know that there was no such Babylonian god, and that the supposed god Ra is only the termination of the Accadian word for god, *dingira*.

We are surprised at such a hasty and ill-considered treatment of this subject from an Oxford professor of ancient history and a Canon of Canterbury.

BOOKS OF THE WEEK.

Complete Preacher, Vol. II. (Religious Newspaper Agency)
De Vinne (T. L.), The Invention of Printing, 2d ed. (Francis Hart & Co.)
Fignanière (Viscount de), Elva: a Poem. (Trübner & Co.)
Storr (E.), L'Allegro, Il Penseroso, and Lycidas. (Livingtons)

JUST PUBLISHED.

AUERBACH'S
LANDOLIN.

16mo (Leisure-Hour Series), \$1.

INTRODUCTION to the TEACHING
of Ancient Languages. (The Natural Method.) By L. Sauv-
veur, Ph.D., LL.D. 12mo, 50 cents.

JANES'S FRENCH GRAMMAR.
A new edition, revised and enlarged. 12mo, \$1.25.

ABECEDAIRE. FRANÇAIS-AN-
glais. Contenant Environ 500 Vignettes. Par le Rev. J. D.
L. Zender. 11e edit on, 12mo, boards, 50 cents.

ABRISS DER GESCHICHTE DER
Deutschen Literatur. (Klemm's Lese- und Sprachbücher.—
VIII. Kreis.) Von L. R. Klemm. 12mo, cloth, \$1.50.

HENRY HOLT & CO.,
New York.

Walter Baker & Co.'s CHOCOLATE, BROMA, AND COCOA.

These preparations have been the standard of excellence for nearly 100 years, and have gained a world-wide reputation. They are pure, nutritious, and wholesome.

Cocoa contains as much flesh-forming matter as beef.

Broma is an excellent food for invalids, unrivalled in delicacy and aroma.

Breakfast Cocoa is a general favorite.

Baker's No. 1 Chocolate is the very best preparation of plain Chocolate in the market.

Vanilla Chocolate is unsurpassed in flavor and quality.

Awarded the highest premium at the Paris, Vienna, and Philadelphia Expositions.

1841. *Diamond Hams*. 1878.

S. DAVIS, JR., CINCINNATI.

PARK & TILFORD and ACKER, MERRALL & CONDIT, New York, have sold the DIAMONDS for more than twenty years. Circulars how to keep and how to cook hams.

PATENT PREPARED Gasolene.

The attention of owners of Gas Machines is invited to the superior quality of Gasolene that we are making. Manufactured by a process that is patented by ourselves, it is peculiarly free from all the impurities and heavy properties commonly found in other Gasolenes.

We manufacture these goods more largely than any other house in the world, and are prepared to furnish any quantity from 80° to 90° Beaumé, by the single barrel or car-load.

Orders solicited from gentlemen owning private country residences. Hotels, Mills, and Manufactories supplied on the most favorable terms.

CHARLES PRATT & CO.,
Established 1770. 128 Pearl Street, New York.

Pratt's Astral Oil.

PERFECTLY SAFE.

Especially adapted for use in the St. Germain Student Lamp.

CHAS. PRATT & CO.,
Box 3050. NEW YORK.

KNOWING that our Cigarettes are second to none, and learning that the red label has led many fastidious persons to suppose cigarettes put up in so attractive a style to be but an ordinary article, has induced the manufacturers to prepare an elegant new and less showy label, hoping thereby to induce some of the many cigarette smokers who are prejudiced against Vanity Fair Cigarettes to give them a trial, which will convince them of their superior excellence. The old label is not abandoned by this change. Connoisseurs may always depend on finding both Vanity Fair Cigarettes and Tobacco fully up to standard.

WM. S. KIMBALL & CO.

Atlantic Mutual INSURANCE CO.

NEW YORK, January 23, 1878.

The Trustees, in conformity to the Charter of the Company, submit the following Statement of its affairs on the 31st December, 1877.

Premiums received on Marine Risks from 1st January, 1877, to 31st December, 1877.....\$4,710,665 83
Premiums on Policies not marked off 1st January, 1877. 2,040,362 61

Total amount of Marine Premiums.....\$6,751,028 44

No Policies have been issued upon Life Risks, nor upon Fire disconnected with Marine Risks.

Premiums marked off from 1st January, 1877, to 31st December, 1877.....\$4,902,331 06

Losses paid during the same period.....\$2,565,890 27

Returns of Premiums and Expenses.....\$947,923 86

The Company has the following Assets, viz.:

United States and State of New York Stock, City, Bank, and other Stocks.....\$10,565,958 00
Loans, secured by Stocks and otherwise.....1,161,200 00
Real Estate and Claims due the Company, estimated at 617,436 01
Premium Notes and Bills receivable.....1,704,393 63
Cash in Bank.....255,364 02

Total Amount of Assets.....\$14,366,351 66

Six per cent. interest on the outstanding certificates of profits will be paid to the holders thereof, or their legal representatives, on and after Tuesday, the Fifth of February, next.

The outstanding certificates of the issue of 1874 will be redeemed and paid to the holders thereof, or their legal representatives, on and after Tuesday, the Fifth of February, next, from which date all interest thereon will cease. The certificates to be produced at the time of payment and cancelled. Upon certificates which were issued for gold premiums the payment of interest and redemption will be in gold.

A dividend of forty per cent. is declared on the net earned premiums of the Company, for the year ending 31st December, 1877, for which certificates will be issued on and after Tuesday, the Seventh of May, next.

By order of the Board,

J. H. CHAPMAN, Secretary.

TRUSTEES.

J. D. Jones, Royal Phelps, Reber, Stuart,
Charles Dennis, Thomas F. Youngs, Jas. C. rest,
W. H. H. Moore, C. A. Hand, Fred. ey,
Lewis Curtis, John D. Hewlett, Cha. verich,
Chas. H. Russell, William H. Webb, Ho. f,
James Low, Charles P. Burdett, Edm. Corlies,
David Lane, Francis Skiddy, J. t,
G. W. Burnham, Alex. V. Blake, ryce,
Daniel S. Miller, Adolph Lemoyne, i. Fogg,
Wm. Sturgis, Robert B. Minturn, King,
Josiah O. Low, Chas. H. Marshall, B. Coddington,
William E. Dodge, George W. Lane, K. Thurber.

J. D. JONES, Vice-President.
CHARLES DE Vice-President.
W. H. H. MOORE, Vice-President.
A. A. RAVEN, 3d Vice-President.

Mutual Benefit Life Insurance Company, Newark, N. J.

Incorporated 1845.

Purely Mutual.

LEWIS C. GROVER, PRESIDENT.

Total Assets, Jan. 1, 1878, . . \$33,181,828 49

All approved forms of policies issued. Reports and Statements furnished at the office of the Company, or any of its Agencies.

JAS. B. PEARSON, VICE-PRESIDENT.
EDWARD A. STRONG, SECRETARY.
B. J. MILLER, ACTUARY.

L. SPENCER GOBLE, STATE AGENT,
Southern New York and Northern New Jersey,
No. 137 BROADWAY, NEW YORK.

BROWN BROTHERS & CO., 59 WALL STREET, ISSUE COMMERCIAL AND TRAVELLERS' CREDITS For use in THIS COUNTRY AND ABROAD.

WINSLOW, LANIER & CO., BANKERS, HAVE FOR SALE SECURITIES FOR SAFE AND PER- MANENT INVESTMENT.

S. G. & G. C. WARD. AGENTS FOR BARING BROTHERS & COMPANY, 42 Wall Street, New York. 28 State Street, Boston.

WILLIAM T. MEREDITH, 37 WILLIAM STREET, NEW YORK, DEALER IN INVESTMENT SECURITIES AND COMMER- CIAL PAPER.

Iowa Mortgage Loans.

when carefully made, are a safe investment, free from speculative influences, and especially adapted to small investors. Int., 8 and 9 per cent.; security worth from three to five times the loan. We refer to many who have made loans through us and have had all their interest paid promptly.

THE BANK OF CRESTON, Creston, Iowa.
B. LOMBARD, JR. JAMES L. LOMBARD.

Missouri Farm Loans

Carefully made on Bond and Mortgage. Interest, 8 to 10 per cent. Perfect security. Well acquainted with local lands and valu s. Best references.

HARRY W. GRANTLEY, Attorney-at-Law,
Appleton City, Missouri.

Illinois Farm Loans.

Money wanted in sums of \$500 and upwards to loan on improved farms in the vicinity of Elgin, Illinois, at 8 per cent. net, for three or five years. Security at least three times the amount loaned. Correspondence solicited. References given. Ten years in business. JOHN W. RANSTEAD, Att'y at Law, Elgin, Ill.

CUNARD LINE. ESTABLISHED 1840.

FOR QUEENSTOWN AND LIVERPOOL.

Sailing from New York every Wednesday. From Boston, once a week.

RATES OF PASSAGE:

CABIN—\$80, \$100, and \$130, gold, according to accommodation. Return tickets on favorable terms.

STEERAGE—\$28 currency. For freight or passage apply to

C. G. FRANCKLYN,

Bowling Green, New York.

NORTH GERMAN LLOYD STEAMSHIP COMPANY, FOR SOUTHAMPTON AND BREMEN.

The Steamers of this Company will sail every Saturday from Bremen Pier, foot of Third Street, Hoboken.

RATES OF PASSAGE TO LONDON, HAVRE, AND BREMEN.

First Cabin, \$100; Second Cabin, \$60 gold. Steerage, \$30 currency. For Freight or passage apply to

OELRICHS & CO., AGENTS,
2 Bowling Green.

Liverpool & London & Globe Insurance Co., 45 William St.

